DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 108 571 IR 002 066

AUTHOR Lowry, Charles B.
TITLE The ACRL Standards and Library Governance, a Comparison of the Personnel Systems of Five Major Academic Libraries.
INSTITUTION North Carolina Univ., Chapel Hill. School of Library Science.
PUB DATE Oct 74
NOTE 86p.; Master's Thesis, North Carolina University

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$4.43 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Faculty Organizations; *Governance; Higher Education; *Librarians; Library Standards; Library Surveys; Literature Reviews; Organizational Change; *Personnel Policy; *Professional Recognition; Tenure; *University Libraries
IDENTIFIERS *Faculty Status; Participative Management

ABSTRACT

Throughout the past decade, there have been increasing demands by American academic librarians for full faculty status, participation in management, and unionization. To determine if these demands have caused changes, a survey was made of the personnel organization schemes at the libraries of five major universities--Texas A&M, Harvard, Minnesota, Oklahoma, and the University of California at Los Angeles--noting how these schemes reflect the Association of College and Research Libraries' standards for faculty status. The question of faculty status for librarians was examined in terms of faculty organizations; librarians' role in governance; and appointment, promotion, and tenure practices. Other aspects of personnel policy; fringe benefits, termination and grievance procedures, compensation, leaves, research funds, and academic freedom; were also examined. It was concluded that, at present, the drive for faculty status is the most favored scheme for the rationalization and improvement of academic library personnel systems; however, personnel practices and participative management schemes are still in a state of flux, and many new directions are possible. (SL)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED108571

THE ACRL STANDARDS AND LIBRARY GOVERNANCE, A COMPARISON OF THE PERSONNEL SYSTEMS OF FIVE MAJOR ACADEMIC LIBRARIES

by

Charles B. Lowry

A research paper submitted to the faculty of the School of Library Science of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science in Library Science.

Chapel Hill

October, 1974

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Approved by:

Edward B. Holley

Adviser

IR000066

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter

I FACULTY STATUS--THE ISSUES.....1

II CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY.....15

III LIBRARIANS AND COVERNANCE.....20

IV APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE.....48

V RESIDUALS--TERMINATION AND GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES, COMPENSATION, LEAVES, RESEARCH FUNDS AND ACADEMIC FREEDOM.....69

VI EPILOGUE.....78

I FACULTY STATUS--THE ISSUES

Edwin E. Williams has stated of Harvard Library's recent reorganization that "in view of what was then happening at Harvard and in other American research libraries, it would have been surprising if no one had proposed during 1970 that there be a review of library staff organization at Harvard and of personnel policies and procedures affecting the staff."[1] The question immediately occurs, what has happened in American academic librarianship to cause the demand for full faculty status, participation in management, and unionization during roughly the last decade? The most succinct answer yet is the late Arthur M. McAnnaly's "Status of the University Librarian in the Academic Community" in the Downs fetschrift.[2] Though his discussion of the historical background of the development of professional status for librarians is made to argue for faculty status, the conditions he describes have led to a wider range of professionalizing activities and organizational patterns. The possibilities of new organizations are varied--from participative management to faculty status. So also are the objectives for which such reorganization is attempted--the needs of library patrons, of library organizations and of librarians. This paper will examine how such transformations of personnel organization schemes at five universities-- Texas A&M, Harvard, Minnesota, Oklahoma and UCLA--reflect the ACRL Standards on faculty status.

The traditional hierarchical organization of libraries--based

on military and papal precedent--is today under assault by numerous forces in universities and university libraries. Robert Downs has pointed to a number of factors: growth of enrollments, changes in the presidency, proliferation of university management, changes in the world of learning, the information explosion, hard times and inflation, planning and budgeting procedures, technology, changing theories of management, unionization, increasing control by state boards, and the failure to develop a national system of information.[3]

A tightening up of the hierarchical structure, as McGregor has clearly shown, will fail to do anything to set the situation right.[4] On the other hand, there has been a constant increase in the demands of rank and file librarians for paricipation in decision making. Unfortunately, "library decision-making as a process has had little consideration paid to it in terms of modern administrative theory."[5] Happily Marchant's application of Rensis Likert's participative management provides empirical data indicating that "the staff's job satisfaction is highly affected by managerial style and the opportunity to participate in decision making process. While top management tends to think of staff involvement basically as a morale booster, it is in fact a distinct asset . . . [which frees them] from making operational decisions and . . . [allows them to] concern themselves with long-range planning and relationships outside the library areas of concern that have previously been identified as inadequately served."[6]

Involvement of staff in decision making is thus a major asset of participative management, but it calls for a system of evaluation different from those previously used. De Prospo suggests that there are four major trends now developing in evaluation systems--the traditional view has been

enlarged to include individual functions as an integral part of the organizations system; organizations are beginning to use evaluations as a means for planning rather than for controlling performance; there has been a decrease in formal evaluation of non-supervisory personnel and increase in the evaluation of supervisory personnel related to change in the composition of the work force; and theoretical research in the social and behavioral sciences has meant increasingly sophisticated evaluation procedures.[7]

Goodman has suggested that the basis for this last trend be called the "Law of Active Participation," which explains the increased participation in decision making as a means of reinforcing workers.

> When a person actively participates in a learning situation he tends to acquire the response far more rapidly, and that these response patterns tend to be more stably formed than when he remains passive . . . . This does not imply, as some would suggest, that employees are involved in all decision-making. It does imply the involvement of employees in decision-making where the outcome involves them as a group or individually . . . . Along with the above concept flows the process of giving greater responsibility to the individual to direct his own activities for the accomplishment of organizational objectives.[8]

The major concern of this paper originally was to be a genus of the family of new trends in personnel organization--the constitutional instruments which have been used to establish faculty status for librarians. The initial review of the literature led to the conclusion that, though some have been published, there has not been a reasoned analysis of any of these documents, beyond description of their general characteristics. On the other hand, a mountain of print has been produced in an effort to explain why librarians should have faculty status, what exactly faculty status is, what benefits and responsibilities will accrue from its establishment, and case studies of how it can be achieved.[9] The critical argument revolves around the question why should librarians have faculty status

at all in view of the fact that there are clear alternatives? Nevertheless, it was becoming clear as early as 1957 that some sort of change must occur in their status, and Arthur McAnally wrote in that year that "many librarians question whether or not the library staff is large enough and wields enough power by itself to achieve a suitable independent status within the university [while others question whether it should attempt to do so]. At any rate, institutional growth is compelling universities to reach decisions about the status of all. Librarians must fall into some appropriate classification like everyone else."[10] At the same time the post-war era had virtually destroyed the old argument against faculty status for librarians based on the assertion that librarians were not teachers. In the first place new technologies and the explosion of publication had made them an integral part of the teaching process of universities and transformed their traditional supra-clerical and administrative roles. In addition, it was increasingly obvious that many professors on American campuses were not much interested in teaching.

Thoughtful support of faculty status has been building for several decades now, though its roots go back to the beginning of the century. The Status of American College and University Librarians appearing in 1958 under the editorship of Robert Downs, presented and effectively organized series of arguments for faculty status. For instance, Lewis Branscomb, the director of Ohio State's libraries, had been associated with a number of academic libraries and drew on his expertise to argue effectively for the establishment of faculty status at Ohio State in a piecemeal fashion.[11] Beyond such pragmatic experiential arguments the essays offered theoretical ones.

> The university library is the laboratory for teaching and research in the humanities and the social studies . . . . It is an

> auxiliary laboratory in the sciences. The undergraduate student may rely heavily upon one or two textbooks in a few of his courses, but in many courses the basic text is but the introduction to a wide range of reading, and in some courses the textbook has been dispensed with altogether. At the graduate level of study the library is an indispensable source of information and service. The same is true of the faculty's need in furthering good teaching and research.[12]

Similar arguments have continued to appear in the intervening years. E. J. Josey, one of the most outspoken proponents of full faculty status, calls for five basic activities which will avoid pitfalls on the way to faculty status: do not wait for students--go to them and become a teacher and thus a "copartner in education"; reject "ideological constraint: the notion that since I don't teach I don't deserve faculty status"; do not become "enmeshed in clerical routines in performance of which faculty colleagues really cannot distinguish [librarians] from the clerical staff of the library"; be willing to accept change (e.g. in personnel structure); avoid rigidity (e.g. resistance to technology.[13] Harold Jones offers the concrete example of the events at CUNY and the activities of LACUNY as a model which had a very positive result once status was achieved.[14]

Opposition to faculty status, like support, has taken varied forms, ranging from obtuse defense of the status quo to the thoughtful proposition that librarians should create their own system of status suitable to their needs. E. G. Mason has presented a strongly stated though brief critique of the faculty system, pointing to factors which librarians should consider before embracing faculty status--imprecision and wasted effort of teaching; a recent decline in the standards of classroom performance; scholarly academic gamesmanship; extreme competiveness embodied in the pressure to publish; and up or out requirements of the faculty promotion system.[15] The essentially

conservative position that librarians are technicians who must aid scholars, but have not the time to be scholars themselves, is exposited by Kellam and Barker.[16] In addition, it may be expected that achieving full faculty status will be made more difficult because of varying ideas of what it means. For instance, the responses of 101 reference department heads to Josey's querying revealed that though over 72% wanted to organize as a faculty they resisted the implications of electing department heads and directors by a fair majority.[17]

Even among those who support faculty status there are reservations which result from the broad spectrum of problems concomitant with its establishment. Holley raises questions in a number of key areas. He states that there is good reason to be skeptical of the assertion that communication within the library and with the outside is really improved by the faculty governance system. Faculty governance also has the obvious weakness of separating the professional from the full time employees as though the latter were interested only in hours, wages and work conditions, and the former only in being part of the decision making process. Moreover, implicit in the principle of governance is the questionable assumption that the library staff can "actually determine policies which will be acceptable to the total university community."[18] De Prospo would obviously oppose such overall authority for planning.[19] Holley also looks at alternatives to the faculty governance scheme. Of the two "behavioristic" experiments he examines--UCLA and Columbia--he finds the former more attractive. Its "Library Administrative Network" retains the feature of strong executive leadership, but disperses planning in numerous institutionalized bodies and recognizes

advancement in position as well as in administration. Most important it makes library administration less remote.[20]

Unionization and applications of the new managerial techniques, like those at UCLA and Columbia,[21] have been increasingly important as a means of tackling the numerous problems of libraries in the last decade. While not necessarily in opposition to faculty status, they do not aim at achieving it as a means of solving library personnel problems, except as another technique. Faculty status is not their objective. On the general subject, New Directions in Staff Development is an excellent example of the literature which has been appearing recently.[22]

In the considerable debate concerning faculty status, one thing is clear, we have a "Tower of Babel" problem. As Massman points out,

> in spite of the voluminous discussions of the question, there is still no accepted definition of academic or faculty status and the two terms have often been used interchangeably. To an outsider looking at the matter dispassionately, this might well come as a surprise, for it is rather unusual for a professional group to argue for something without first defining precisely what it wants.[23]

It is possible of course to define faculty by function.

> A faculty,be it a department, school, or college, is an association of colleagues banded together by a common interest. They establish their own policies concerning themselves and their work, within limits, and conduct their own affairs. They usually vote, or a subcommittee does, on new appointments, promotions, and tenure recommendations. They accept leadership but they tend to resent authority and to reject dictators. They are not administered though they may be led; they are co-equals, colleagues, and individualists.[24]

The ACRL standards are an attempt to define faculty status. Yet in their genesis they brought a barrage of criticism, even from some supporters of faculty status.[25] Some of these early criticisms have been

ameliorated by subsequent additions to the ACRL standards.[26] Gates was concerned with the failure to include a provision for a nine month year in the standards, while at the same time calling for full faculty obligations. "For the academic librarian, a concept of full equality as academic faculty which omits equal compensation, a nine-month commitment, and corresponding responsibilities is empty."[27] He believes that publications in such circumstances will be burdensome if not impossible. In addition, Parker has shown that among different libraries faculty status has been achieved in a highly differential manner, a condition the ACRL standards are intended to help remedy. He has presented much data from 164 academic libraries in twenty states, a good sample. Of these 140 or 86% considered themselves to have faculty status, but only 37% or 61 had all the status and benefits that are received by professors. The critical factor in full faculty status for academic librarians appears to be whether or not they work the academic year or the twelve month year.[28] Littleton's survey of the ASERL members shows the present diversity of one region. Faculty rank and title were possessed by ten of the twenty six schools, equivalent rank (librarian series) by five, and assimilated rank (library title with rank of faculty) by one. Nine had academic status without faculty title, and in one the librarians had non-academic status and were unclassified. None of the schools classified librarians as civil service employees.[29]

What are the basic motivations for seeking faculty status? "That librarians in general and academic librarians in particular have long been concerned about their status is no secret, and librarians have been accused of seeking faculty rank almost as an end in itself."[30] DeWeese's excellent

study of thirty nine librarians in a large midwestern university confirms this view. He found, however, that "status concerns are an important socio-psychological determinant of professionalization."[31] Thus at least in one library status concerns contributed directly to a more professional response from librarians. It is also clear that status can be a means of providing the opportunity for better service, since acceptance as peers in the educational enterprise increases the librarians opportunity to be of service. It is obvious that gaining faculty status means faculty benefits and it can be argued with DePriest, that librarians do not exhibit either an excessive or droll concern for faculty status, but that they deserve it on the same grounds as do faculty--intellectual freedom, contributions to scholarship, and the like.[32]

Librarians have long been aware that faculty status is not an unmixed blessing. McAnally pointed to some of the difficulties early on, calling on librarians to accept the full obligations of being academicians and to "submit to the same rigid standards of judgement which teaching faculty members apply to themselves and their colleagues . . . [and] faculty responsibilities for membership in committees, participation in the intellectual life of the institution, and research and publication."[33] Not the least of these responsibilities is that of education, which ranges into many other ancillary problems. The complexity of this issue is illustrated by Smith's 1970 article which points to a number of major concerns. The inability of outsiders to distinguish between clerical and professional librarians, he believes, signifies a need to "realign functions within the library and to concentrate on expanding sophisticated professional service."[34]

Serious obstacles of varied nature abound. A crucial problem is the bureaucratic structure of libraries, which emphasizes institutional functions.[35] Another problem is illustrated by a recent study showing that the profession attracts few of the highest level students and fails to keep many of the best which it attracts. There is a need for changes in library education which will produce that "rare hybrid" the "librarian-scholar."[36] These are the problems which librarians must face in establishing full faculty status, which is much more than a matter of position and benefits. It is closely tied to the present and future roles of librarians in higher education.

The concomitant responsibility of publication and research has already been alluded to. Jesse Shera speaks for the advanced position that librarians should fulfill the same research role as faculty now do.[37] Participation in library governance has, by contrast, been eagerly sought by librarians. Galloway's discussion of the role of library faculty in selecting a director and Moriarty's instruction to directors to act like deans and chairmen of departments and go to bat for the library with the general administration are clear indications of this trend.[38] But governance means more. It means that librarians will begin to participate in academic committees involved in the governance of the entire academic community not just the library. Finally, library faculty will have to maintain a high level of professional activity, including participation in scholarly organizations, continuing education and the like.

Here it is necessary to restate that academic status and faculty status do not mean the same thing. Full faculty status grants benefits not

just to librarians but "it appears that granting faculty status to librarians directly benefits the institution by enccuraging librarians to pursue advanced study and research . . . . There are, moreover, definite indications that librarians were more likely to meet faculty standards in the institutions at which they had faculty status."[39]

REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER I

[1]"Harvard's Study Committee on Professional Library Personnel," Harvard Library Bulletin, XXI (July, 1973), 279. (Hereinafter referred to as "Harvard's Study Committee.")

[2]Jerrold Orne, ed., Research Librarianship, Essays in Honor of Robert B. Downs (New York: R. R. Bowker Co., 1971),pp. 19-50. (Hereinafter referred to as Research Librarianship.)

[3]Arthur M. McAnally and Robert B. Downs, "The Changing Role of Directors of University Libraries," College and Research Libraries, XXXIV (March, 1973), 104-9.

[4]Douglas McGregor, The Human Side of Enterprise (New York: McGraw Hill, 1960), pp. 1-45.

[5]Maurice P. Marchant, "Participative Management as Related to Personnel Development," Library Trends, XX (July, 1971), 50.

[6]Ibid., 51, 53-54.

[7]Ernest R. De Prospo, "Personnel Evaluation as an Impetus to Growth," Library Trends, XX (July, 1971), 64. (Hereinafter referred to as "Personnel Evaluation.")

[8]Robert B. Downs, ed., The Status of American College and University Librarians, ACRL Monograph No. 22 (Chicago: American Library Association, 1958), pp. 44-45. (Hereinafter referred to as Status.)

[9]As of November 1973 the last word on this subject was Huling's annotated bibliography, which "attempted to include all articles, books, letters, and news items directly pertaining to the topic of faculty status." Nancy Huling, "Faculty Status--A Comprehensive Bibliography," College and Research Libraries, XXXIV (November, 1973), 440-62.

[10]Downs, Status, p. 32.

[11]Ibid., pp. 42-43.

[12]Ibid., p. 112.

[13]E. J. Josey, "Faculty Status for Librarians," Library Journal, IVC (April 15, 1971), 1333-36.

[14]Harold D. Jones, "LACUNY: a Library Association in Action," California Librarian, XXIX (July, 1972), 204-9.

[15]Ellsworth Mason, "A Short Happy View of Our Emulation of Faculty," College and Research Libraries, XXXIII (November, 1972), 445.

[16]Porter W. Kellam and Dale L. Barker, "Activities and Opportunities of University Librarians for Full Participation in the Educational Enterprise," College and Research Libraries, XXIX (May, 1968), 195-99.

[17]E. J. Josey, "Full Faculty Status This Century: The Report of the Survey of New York State Academic Librarians," Library Journal, IIIC (March 15, 1972), 986.

[18]Edward G. Holley, "Who Runs Libraries? The Emergence of Library Governance in Higher Education," Wilson Library Bulletin, IIL (September, 1973), 48.

[19]De Prospo, "Personnel Evaluation," 60-70.

[20]Edward G. Holley, "Organization and Administration of Urban University Libraries," College and Research Libraries, XXXIII (May, 1972) 183-85.

[21]For a discussion of Columbia's organization see Booz, Allen, & Hamilton Inc., Organization and Staffing of the Libraries of Columbia University (Wasnington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, 1972).

[22]Elizabeth W. Stone, ed., New Directions in Staff Development, Moving from Ideas to Action (Chicago: American Library Association, 1971).

[23]Virgil F. Massman, Faculty Status for Librarians (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press Inc., 1972), p. 11.

[24]Orne, Research Librarianship, pp. 31-32.

[25]There are a number of strongly stated objections with general commentary and alternative standards in Robert M. Pierson, "The Proposed Standards for Faculty Status: A Dissenting Opinion," College and Research Libraries News (May, 1971), 121-27. See also "Academic Status"" College and Research Libraries News (June, 1971), 173-74, for other relevant objections.

[26]An example of this is the opposition to the initial requirement for two masters degrees appearing in the June 1971 standards. See letter from Alvin Skipsna, College and Research Libraries News (June, 1971), 171, 174. The eventual acceptance in the standards of the MLS as the terminal degree removed this objection. See "Model Statement of Criteria and Procedures for Appointment, Promotion in Academic Rank, and Tenure for College and University Librarians," College and Research Libraries News (September, 1973), 192.

[27]Harry R. Gates, "Academic Status Illusion and the Nine-Month Contract," Pacific Northwest Library Association Quarterly, XXXVI (January, 1972), 3.

[28]J. Carlyle Parker, "Faculty Status and the Academic Work Year," California Librarian, XXXIII (July, 1972), 143-49.

[29]I. T. Littleton, "Current Status of University Librarians in Association of Southeastern Research Libraries," Southeastern Librarian, XXI (Spring, 1971), 25.

[30]Massman, Faculty Status for Librarians, p. 23.

[31]L. Carroll DeWeese, "Status Concerns and Library Professionalism," College and Research Libraries, XXXIII (January, 1972), 31.

[32]Raleigh DePriest, "That Inordinate Passion for Status," College and Research Libraries, XXXIV (March, 1973), 150, 151-58.

[33]Downs, Status, p. 36.

[34]Eldred R. Smith, "Academic Status for College and University Librarians--Problems and Prospects," College and Research Libraries, XXXI (January, 1970), 8-9.

[35]Ibid., 10.

[36]Ibid.

[37]Jesse Shera, "The Role of College College Librarian--a Reappraisal" in Library-Instructional Integration on the College Level, ACRL Monograph No. 13 (Chicago: Association of College and Reference Libraries, 1955).

[38]Louise Galloway, "Academic Librarians Participate in the Selection of a Director of Libraries," College and Research Libraries, XXXIII (May, 1972, 220-27. John H. Moriarty, "Academic in Deed," College and Research Libraries, XXXI (January, 1970), 16.

[39]Massman, Faculty Status for Librarians, p. 87.

II CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY

Probably the single greatest problem in establishing systems of governance for academic libraries has been the lack of sufficient precedent. Early experiments were some indication, but insufficient experience was still an inhibiting factor. In addition, lack of participation by the ALA in the past has meant that each institution has had to fight its own fight for faculty status which meant a slow process of two to twelve years. Equally debilitating was the attitude that though librarianship is a profession it should stand apart from faculties. This, Arthur McAnnally asserts, reduced librarians to powerlessness in the university setting. However, a landmark event was the foundation of "a most influential professional group in the drive for academic recognition for librarians . . . the Committee on Academic Status of the University Libraries Section of ACRL" in 1958.[1] From this start the movement for establishing a positive ALA policy toward support of full faculty status grew and culminated by the beginning of the seventies in a firm stand in favor of such status. This new position was reflected in the alliance between ALA (particularly ACRL) and the AAUP, with the most important result being the drafting of formal standards for faculty status.

The preliminary work for this paper was posited on an effort to compare the instruments of faculty status (constitutions, bylaws, etc.) of several university libraries to the ACRL standards. Such a research empha-

sis has merit. However, a shortcoming of this approach is that it leaves untouched a whole range of personnel organization schemes which do not come under the heading of "full faculty status." It, therefore, seemed appropriate to broaden the scope of the examination to include other forms of organization in the comparison.

Three schools were selected for study which had faculty organizations. Oklahoma University at Norman was in the vanguard of institutions which early began to move towards faculty status for librarians. Its efforts were piecmeal and stretched over more than a decade in an ongoing ad hoc process. This method of achieving faculty status is characteristic of the early cases where the pool of past experience and the outside support in the profession as a whole was small. Minnesota University falls in the middle range of institutions. The work of establishing faculty status for librarians had a broader base of experience on which to draw, and it was in later stages possible to consider the ACRL standards. Texas A&M University has more recently developed faculty status for its librarians with the result that it has been able to examine a full range of cases already extant and to use the ACRL standards explicitly in the formation of its organization.

The University of California, Los Angeles has followed a program of staff development which draws on the newer managerial theory. It can be argued that faculty organizations reflect implicitly the principles of behaviorism that are being built into the new schemes of participative management. At UCLA, however, the choice was to build a system which explicitly expressed participative management techniques and avoided the neces-

sary adjustments required to adapt the faculty model to the universe of the library. UCLA, therefore, gives a nice contrast to the faculty systems of the three universities with faculty status. Harvard, on the other hand, is an example of the development of a parallel scheme of library ranks, a system of governance based on unique local needs, and benefits and responsibilities modeled on the faculty norm. It seems obvious from the UCLA and Harvard examples that the spirit of the ACRL standards, if not the specific terminology and requirements, can be fulfilled without implementing full faculty status. The resultant systems are, however, limited by their avoidance of faculty principles, and within those limits there are specific requirements of the ACRL standards which simply cannot be met.

Within each of these new systems of faculty organization the authority of the director of libraries has remained unchanged. Moreover, except at UCLA, the old administrative hierarchy has been retained intact. Past experience seems to tell us that this will continue to be the case. This seeming paradox has been questioned.

> One puzzling aspect of the trend toward academic governance is that the organization charts remain much the same. That follows logically from the concept which mandates that the staff makes policies and the administration carries out those policies. However, can this be done realistically in a traditional hierarchical structure?[2]

This places one unavoidable requirement on all librarians involved in the implementation of new systems of organization. Both administrators and rank and file must enter into the stages of development and implementation with the resolve that open communications and a spirit of good faith will prevail. Otherwise, they will be assured of failure. They must consider also two other basic questions.

1. How do they want to participate in library management?
2. Will staff participation benefit not only staff, but the library's clientele as well?

No questions deserve more thoughtful consideration by academic librarians at the present time.[3]

The ACRL has established the guidelines within which it recommends answering these questions in a series of documents--the "Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians"; the "Joint Statement [of the ACRL and AAUP] on Faculty Status of College and University Librarians"; the "Model Statement of Criteria and Procedures for Appointment, Promotion in Academic Rank, and Tenure for College and University Librarians"; and "Appendixes to Model Statement of Criteria and Procedures for Appointment, Promotion in Academic Rank, and Tenure for College and University Librarians." These have, in the period from 1970 to 1973, articulated the ACRL's position.[4]

REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER II

[1]Jerrold Orne, ed., Research Librarianship, Essays in Honor of Robert B. Downs (New York: R. R. Bowker Co., 1971), p. 29.

[2]Edward G. Holley, "Who Runs Libraries? The Emergence of Library Governance in Higher Education," Wilson Library Bulletin, IIL (September, 1973), 47.

[3]Ibid., 48

[4]"ACRL Academic Status Committee Proposes Standards for Librarians," College and Research Libraries News (October, 1970), 269-73. "Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians," College and Research Libraries News (June, 1971), 170-72. "Joint Statement on Faculty Status of College and University Librarians," College and Research Libraries News (September, 1972), 209-12. "Model Statement of Criteria and Procedures for Appointment, Promotion in Academic Rank, and Tenure for College and University Librarians," College and Research Libraries News (September, 1973), 192-95. "Appendixes to Model Statement of Criteria and Procedures for Appointment, Promotion in Academic Rank, and Tenure for College and University Librarians," College and Research Libraries News (October, 1973), 243-57. These documents are in fact a single corpus detailing the position of the ACRL as it developed over a three year period. For the purposes of this paper they will be referred to simply as the "ACRL standards." The original approval was announced in 1971. See "Standards for Faculty Status Approved," College and Research Libraries News (September, 1971), 217.

III LIBRARIANS AND GOVERNANCE

The ACRL standards require that libraries adopt a form of governance which is academic. Librarians must be organized as a faculty having a role and powers equivalent to those of faculties of a college, school or department. The director of libraries would, in such a scheme, function as a chairman of a department or a dean of a school or college. Responsibilities for governance are to be shared among the library faculty, representatives of the general faculty (e.g. the library board selected by the university senate), and administrative officers. In addition, librarians are to have a role equal to other academic faculty in college and university governance such as eligibiligy for membership in the academic or university senate. It is worth mentioning that the ACRL standards uniformly require that library faculties be treated on an equal footing with the teaching faculties in all matters--governance, appointment, promotion, tenure, termination and grievance procedures, compensation, leaves, research funds, and academic freedom.[1]

It is important, before examining the governance systems of the five universities, to digress momentarily and consider the failure of the ACRL standards to provide explicitly for clerical or non-professional staff in the standards for governance. Librarians have long been plagued by the dilemma of their desire to distinguish themselves from "non-professionals" and their conscious recognition of the quite professional skills and competence such people often acquire over years of good service. At the same time

librarians usually work much more closely with their supportive staff than do regular teaching faculty. The result is that not infrequently librarians in organizing themselves on the faculty model provide for input, if not direct participation, by these staff members in the system of governance. Excepting Texas A&M, all of the institutions in this study have made explicit efforts to comprehend their non-librarian staff members in their systems of personnel organization.

The UCLA libraries are a widespread system serving both the University and surrounding community. The organization of the library which now is in effect took shape principally under the tutelage of Robert Vosper as University Librarian. Participative management is its obvious intent.

> The goal of the Library Administrative Network is to provide an opportunity for staff members, at all levels, to share in this search [for creative, innovative, practical solutions to problems], to contribute to library decision-making, to hear and to be heard, and to widen their personal horizons. The Network arose from the Library's sensitivity to the need for greater awareness of staff feeling, for more staff participation in the discussion of library matters, and for more effective communication; the staff has been deeply involved in its design over the past few years. It is an experiment in the restructuring of the pattern of library management.[2]

The historical antecedants of the Network (LAN) are to be found in a number of organizations and studies. For many years the administrative committee was composed of the thirty heads of the UCLA Library units, and the Library Staff Association, comprising both clerical and professional library employees, was the only staff organization. But in 1967 the Librarian's Association with only professional membership was formed. At about the same time the University Librarian in consultation with the Library Staff Association suggested the "UCLA Library System Employee Relations Study" be undertaken. This study resulted in the Lademann Report. A spinoff

from this report was the Menkin Report on the Arrowhead Conference decisions, which basically called for the organization of the Committee on Committees to develop recommendations for functional committees, and in the meantime, by May of 1968, the basic structure recommended at Arrowhead was put into effect. With the establishment of the Staff Resource Committees (functional committees) in February 1969 the Library Administrative Network came into existence.[3]

In the spirit of flexibility which the whole project demonstrates, the ad hoc Library Administrative Network Evaluation Committee (LANEC) was formed with the responsibility of gathering data on the effectiveness of the experiment and making recommendations for improvements. Among the most important results of its work was the elimination of some of the Staff Resource Committees (SRC's) and the establishment of a permanent Network Operations Committee (NOC) with the function of independently monitoring the operation of LAN for effectiveness and recommending changes in structure and functions of its various parts.[4] "NOC's authority lies in its administrative and managerial role as it monitors and evaluates the operation of the Network. In this capacity, NOC is responsible to the University Librarian [an ex officio member[5]] as it assumes some delegated authority to administer the mechanisms of LAN."[6] It should be emphasized that NOC is not an SRC, but rather a specific component in the network itself. Besides the University Librarian, NOC's membership includes representatives of the two staff associations and seven members from any rank in the library staff.[7]

It is clear that in a library system as large as UCLA's a structure designed to increase communication would necessarily be complex and diffi-

cult to describe. The cardinal principle, underlying the seeming overlap and redundancy in the organization, is to provide avenues of communication and input moving both up and down the authority ladder and across the various "geographic" organizational units of the Library. At the same time, it should be remembered that LAN does not administer the library, but supplements a somewhat hierarchical structure. LAN's function is advisory.

The chief administrative officers of the library--University Librarian, Associate University Librarian for Public Services, Associate University Librarian for Technical Services, Assistant University Librarian for Personnel and Staff Development, and Assistant University Librarian for Planning—comprise the chief authority in the Network, the "Library Administrative Officers." The University Librarian who is chairman of this committee has the ultimate responsibility for decisions and for developing and administering policy, but the Assistant and Associate Librians have no line authority. They function as resource and advisory personnel. The officers of the committee report back to LAN through the other assignments which they hold in the Network.

In terms of definable duties the most amorphous units in the Network are the five Random Groups, random because of the means of their selection. Membership in the Random Groups is composed of the heads of the various units of the library, which may be departments, services, reading rooms, functional groups (e.g. bibliographers), or libraries. The composition of the groups is randomly determined once a year, providing that the various Unit Heads throughout the system will have opportunities to interact, sharing problems and widening their individual perspectives in informal meetings with no minutes. They are encouraged to communicate the discussions to their individual staffs. The chairmanship of each random group is related

and the chairman attends the meetings of the Advisory Council.

The consultative responsibilities of the University Librarian are further broadened as chairman of the Advisory Council which is composed also of the other Administrative Officers, chairman of the Random Groups, and on a rotating basis, representatives from the Library Staff Association and Librarians' Association. Chairman of both the Network Operations Committee (NOC) and Staff Resource Committees (SRC's) attend as observers, providing an avenue of communication for any staff member who may not wish to go through his own Unit Head. The principal role of the Random Group chairmen and the representatives from the two staff associations is to serve as a communications interface between the Advisory Council and the groups they represent. One result of the principle of rotation as applied to their membership in the Advisory Council is to reduce the continuity of membership and prevent systematic long term planning and recommendations. Such matters are for this reason usually referred to the Staff Resource Committees, and polls taken in the Advisory Council are, therefore, not binding.[8]

Presently there are four Staff Resource Committees with the elimination of three after the LANEC study.[9] These include the Personnel Committee, Collection Development Committee, Technical Services Committee, amd Public Services Committee. These Committees provide the working center of the Library Administrative Network, preparing formal recommendations for action and participating in implementation. They serve as "long-range, system-wide investigative bodies" for the areas of operation implied by their names.[10] As with much of LAN, the structure of the committees is designed to maximize staff input and education and to draw upon the expertise of those most

knowledgable about problems under consideration.

Each of the Staff Resource Committees has a "charge" which defines its role and at the same time the composition of its membership and terms of appointment.[11] In accord with the intent that they should "draw upon the resources of the total staff talent and expertise," their membership is balanced between junior and senior staff. Pivotal in the membership of each committee is the inclusion of the appropriate administrative officer, who serves ex officio. For instance, the Associate University Librarian for Technical Services serves on the Technical Services Committee.[12] These committees have the responsibility of advising the ex officio member, the Library Advisory Council, and the University Librarian concerning problems within their purview. Ex officio members participate in the SRC's meetings, supplying their expert knowledge when asked to do so, but not making final decisions. Along with the chairman of each committee they are the representatives to LAN as discussed above.[13]

The Library Administrative Network provides a dynamic vehicle for the transmission of information, opinion, knowledge, and needs. As is suggested in this description, the individual staff member has a number of avenues of communication including the two staff associations, his unit head attending the Random Group meetings, and the meetings of the various SRC's which are open to librarians on request. In addition, various staff members may be asked, because of their expertise, to attend SRC meetings. After a year of service, new members of the UCLA library staff become eligible to serve on the SRC's and are placed on a roster of staff members, excluding those currently serving. The order in which staff members are

appointed is designed to allow the "fullest and widest participation of staff, balance experience and inexperience on all committees, and reflect the special needs as provided for in charges . . . . Every volunteer will eventually be called."[14]

With regard to the ACRL standards, the UCLA system of governance, though not a faculty system, is admirably suited to fulfill the intent of staff participation. Yet in one area, University governance, there is no provision for the membership of librarians. They remain in that large group of university employees who do not participate in academic governance, and this is a product of the fact that they are not organized as an academic faculty.[15]

It took more than a decade for the University of Oklahoma Libraries to achieve full faculty status through an ad hoc process of acquiring privileges piecemeal. Under the leadership of Arthur McAnally the process involved pushing the administration for formal grant of privileges while encouraging the library staff to assume those responsibilities incumbent on faculty members.[16] The results are an admirable model for the achievement of faculty status, and are embodied in the Rules of the Faculty, an instrument under constant revision and scrutiny in the faculty meetings with periodic revisions of the entire document.[17] In the wisdom of hindsight it is possible to see the incipient faculty status at O.U. in 1951 with the founding of the Staff Association and appointment of McAnally as Director of the University Libraries with the status of Dean, in itself an indication of the importance of the libraries. The first sabbatical leave was granted a librarian in 1956. McAnally encouraged the participation of librarians in management, notably in the area of appointment of

professionals. In 1963 the Board of Regents granted academic status to librarians. The advisory and policy making body during these years was the Library Council which was composed of the division and branch heads. Though it met only twice a year it played an important role in planning major tasks. In 1967 O.U. President Cross granted specific academic rank to professional librarians. Within fifteen months the librarians had approached and solved the basic problems of establishing tenure and faculty governance. In October 1968 the first formal statement of policy drawn by the ad hoc Committee charged with studying the issue of faculty governance was adopted.[18]

The Library Faculty includes the administrative officers and librarians or other professionals holding rank--Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, or Instructor. Members of the general faculty employed half time or more by the library may be granted membership by vote of the library faculty. The Director serves as the Dean of a non-departmentalized college, but for administrative purposes the library is divided into traditional branches--Public Services, Technical Services, and Special Collections. In its monthly meetings the Library Faculty is presided over by the Director as ex officio chairman and in this absence by the secretary-treasurer. There is also a representative appointed by the chairman of the Classified Staff Association, the non-professional employees' organization. Election of the Secretary-Treasurer and the members of Committee A are conducted in May and special elections are held for unexpired terms. A feature of the O.U. "Rules" which is unique among the schools studied is the inclusion of a dues requirement for Library Faculty. These funds are used to entertain persons invited for interviews, and the money

is administered by the Alumni Development Fund.

The O.U. Library Faculty conducts itself under the same rules as other O.U. faculties, the Handbook for Faculty Members of the University of Oklahoma. The duties of the Library Faculty involve making decisions on a range of matters including recommendations of new staff appointments, granting of tenure (as outlined in the Faculty Handbook), and recommending new policies and procedures relevant to Library operation. To assist in this task there are two other bodies provided for in the O.U. Rules.

Committee "A" consists of two members, serving two year terms elected on alternating years from the Library Faculty. The Director is the Chairman. Its chief function is the preparation and transmission of formal recommendations on matters such as budget, salary increases, and promotions in rank. It is also responsible for the presentation of the names of persons who have become eligible for tenure.

The Administrative and Advisory Council is a less formal body which consists of eight or more Library faculty, including the heads of various departments and Divisions (the administrative staff), and generally one or two others who are called on because they are directly concerned with the topic under consideration. This body does not make policy, but rather serves as a sounding board for the Director and a "forum for discussion of current Library problems." The apparent administrative top heaviness of this organization is considerably diluted by its actual operations as described by McAnally.

> Now I have a Monday morning staff meeting, very informal, membership varying according to the problem orsubject to be discussed. It has no power, but is an opinion and discussion group.[19]

Formal relations with the rest of Oklahoma University are carried on in two ways. By early 1968 the Library Faculty had the right to representation in the Faculty Senate.[20] On the other hand, the Committee on University Libraries, referred to sometimes as the Faculty Library Council, consists of nine members appointed by the President from a list submitted by the University Senate. The functions of the committee are couched in general terms: to make studies and recommendations concerning the apportioning of Library book funds; to advise with the director in matters pertaining to the Libraries; to make studies and recommendations on matters of policy; and to report annually to the President and the University Senate. However, the Committee may not concern itself with the details of library administration and has no control over membership in the Library Faculty.

The O.U. faculty system is spare and simple. It lacks, for instance, the elaborate mechanisms for feedback built into other faculty organizations or the participative system of UCLA. However, it is possible to guage how much input the faculty has. In the first place, the monthly faculty meetings are by any standard frequent. The faculty is constantly revising the rules and voting on important issues, as a perusal of any year's minutes will show. Moreover the Rules do not contain the usual constitutional requirements, such as two thirds majority, which tend to inhibit ready modification of the faculty's functions and operating procedures.[21]

Among the major considerations leading to the drafting of the "University Libraries, Twin Cities Campus Constitution" was the growing cognizance of the need to stimulate communication within the library system through some formal institutional vehicle. But unlike UCLA where such a desire led to a participative management scheme, at Minnesota a faculty

governance scheme was adopted. An important characteristic was the adoption by 70 of the ACRL proposals and the use of this eleven point program as a sort of model for building on at Minnesota.[22]

The felt need for better staff communication, participation, development and orientation was focused initially through the Executive Committee of the former Staff Association. In the autumn of 1968 the Committee resolved to suggest an organization representative of the entire library system of the Twin Cities Campus. The resultant Constitution Committee appointed in November was composed of twelve members representative of all facets of the library staff. By March 1969 a draft constitution was ready for the scrutiny of the staff and after the addition of amendments was approved by April.[23]

As with the other faculty governance schemes discussed in this paper, the Minnesota Constitution superimposes participation of the library staff over the older administrative system. Thus the old chains of command and sources of authority remain, but are greatly modified if not transformed. While not as institutionally elaborate as the Library Administrative Network of UCLA, the Minnesota Constitution provides for a richness of communications which may be lost in a description of its provisions.

The sections related to the Director are intended to stress the staff's participation. He is appointed by the University President, after recommendations of the President's ad hoc search committee and with the advice of the Library Council, which is empowered to appoint its own ad hoc committee representative of the whole library staff. The appointment is for a term of eight years and is renewable after review.[24] As has been

suggested this may be a solution to the multitude of diverse pressures on the directors office which seem to grow each day.[25] The Director is charged with implementing policy and planning in consultation with the Library Faculty and Library Faculty Assembly, and he is the representative of the library to other parts of the University.[26] Characteristically, the Director retains final authority to make budgetary recommendations after consultation with the administrative staff and Library Council.[27]

As with the director, the rest of the administrative staff--associate director, assistant director, and department heads--serve term appointments, in their case five years, which are renewable after a review initiated by the director. However, the Library Council may recommend earlier review and must be consulted on initial appointments and renewals of appointments. The Constitutions calls also for the implementation of procedures which will involve the staff in these reviews and in reviews of each department and its functions at least every five years.[28]

Because it is intended to increase participation by all staff and communications in all directions the "Twin Cities Campus Constitution" provides an overlapping system of committees and constituted bodies. The Library faculty is the policy making and legislative body of the library consisting of the President of the University, Director of Libraries, and regularly appointed professors, associate professors, instructors, research associates, fellows and subject specialists with professional appointments.[29] The Director is the presiding officer. Vice-chairman and secretary are elected from the faculty.[30]

The Library faculty assembly is a deliberative body with no specific charge. It is presently constituted as a body chiefly devoted

to airing opinions and exchanges of ideas among the whole staff. In practice it has the residual powers of the Library faculty, that is, it votes on matters not strictly confined to faculty members, and is composed of the Library faculty, Library Civil Service Committee, Student Consultative Committee and the Senate Library Committee. Quarterly meetings are provided for, but special meetings may be called by the Chairman (the Director), the Library Council or by a petition of fifteen members. All staff members may attend meetings and speak on issues, but voting is restricted to the Library faculty, Senate Library Committee and members of the Library Civil Service Committee and Student Consultative Committee. In addition, the latter two committees may not vote in elections or cases, such as tenure, where a majority of the faculty is required. Special meetings, open only to faculty members, may be called by the Director, Library Council, or a petition of fifteen members.[31]

The Library Council consists of nine members elected at large for two year terms from the Library faculty, and an ex officio member with full voting rights designated by the Library Civil Service Committee from its membership. The Council in its monthly meetings is an advisory body to the Director, and is the representative of the faculty to which it is responsible. It discusses and makes recommendations to the Director (who may be invited to its meetings) on all matters of library policy, It also transmits recommendations of the Library faculty and Library faculty assembly to the Director.[32] In cases when the Director dissents from a Library Council recommendation, a Library faculty assembly vote may be requested by either.[33]

The Standing Committees, which meet monthly, are responsible for

the formulation and recommendation of policy, and each reports to the Director and Library Council, which "shall act upon their findings and recommendations." Thus the Standing Committees generate the "paperwork" which makes the faculty governance system of the University of Minnesota Libraries go. Each committee has seven members elected from the Library faculty, one ex officio member appointed from the Library Council with full voting rights, and one member elected from the Library Civil Service Staff. The Collection Development Committee, (public) Service Committee, Staff Welfare and Development Committee, and Operations and Planning Committee are provided for in Article V of the Constitution. The Senate Library Committee and the Student Consultative Committee designate an ex officio member to all Standing Committees except the Staff Welfare and Development Committee.[34]

There are three other constituted committees which deserve attention. The first of these, the Library Civil Service Committee is an important feature of the Constitution. It is responsible for formulating policy on personnel matters relating to civil service staff, and may adopt grievance procedures and make policy recommendations for the Library. Its membership includes twenty civil service staff and it reports to the Director and Library Council, "which shall act on its findings and recommendations."[35] In addition, the Student Consultative Committee, which represents the interests of the University's students, may consider and make recommendations on policy. It is composed of eight students, a designated member from the Library Council and each of the Standing Committees except the Staff Welfare and Development Committee, and reports to the Director and

Library Council under the same conditions as other committees. Finally, the Committee on Faculty Personnel consists of seven tenured academic staff elected at large by the library faculty and reporting to the Director and Library Council. It formulates and recommends policy on all matters relating to the establishment of procedures for appointments, tenure, promotions, salary, grievances and removal of faculty members in accordance with the Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure.[36]

The relationship of the Library to the University is also defined by the Constitution in Articles VII and VIII, which describe the Senate Library Committee, and the representation of the Libraries in the University Senate. The Senate Library Committee has always functioned as an advisory body to the Director and the Library faculty.[37] Librarians, in anticipation of recognition, elected their first representatives to the University Senate during the 1971-1972 academic year. "Heretofore, Library representation in the Senate was achieved by election of Library faculty members through the College of Liberal Arts."[38]

Librarians at Minnesota are especially proud of two features of their system. First, the inclusion of non-librarians with librarians is not a new departure. However, the level of participation of non-librarians is certainly noteworthy, even compared to a non-faculty participative system such as UCLA's. In the second place, they believe that the weakness of the executive officer in the new staff structure "provides for the taking of action which reflects the wishes of the members at large."[39]

How does this system work when translated from paper to "real life?" A strong sense of the ongoing process can be gained by browsing

in the "Library Faculty Assembly Minutes." It is clear, first of all, that there is a fairly high level of participation, as evidenced in committee activities, voting for officers, the addition of "Associate Members", and the like. Evident also is the continued central role of the Director. Nor has the system been put into effect with ease. It has required constant attention to development of bylaws, to committee work, and to the issues of the importance and role of the civil service employees.[40] That is the price of a system which maximizes participation, a goal unattainable without cost to swiftness and "clearcuttedness" of decision making.

Harvard's Library, like those in other universities, has been affected by the recent period of flux in organization. Beginning with the "Dunlop Committee" in 1968, a number of studies were undertaken at Harvard concerning personnel organization, recruitment, and benefits on a university wide basis.[41] In 1970 administrative officers proposed a Study Committee on Professional Library Personnel, which was duly appointed and prepared nine recommendations, encompassing the full range of the ACRL standards. It further recommended a Study Committee on Professional Personnel, which was elected in the spring of the year. Thus unlike the ad hoc approach, which has been favored by circumstances elsewhere, at Harvard a well designed "charge" covering the full range of issues was the basis for action.[42]

To understand the development of the HUL personnel system, it is necessary to remember the "high degree of decentralization and autonomy that prevails here. 'Every tub on its own bottom' has been the financial

tradition, and this has fostered the administrative independence of the various faculties and research institutions . . . . The Study Committee, consequently, encountered certain problems that would not be faced by a similar committee in a more centralized institution."[43] Moreover, like UCLA Harvard eschewed a program of faculty status, but did not opt for a participative management scheme. In view of the ACRL campaign, it is surprising that only a few of the members of the staff and no Study Committee member proposed the faculty alternative. Harvard librarians clung to the course laid down by Paul Buck in 1958. "When an institution's faculty is regarded as its only fully professional group, there is a strong case indeed for including librarians in that group, but this is not the case at Harvard."[44]

The path thus chosen has not always proved a smooth one as recent events concerning review, appointment and retirement benefits illustrate. "The proposed changes . . . seem to us evidence of a growing tendency at Harvard to class professional librarians as merely a superior kind of nonacademic staff . . . . Our greatest concern of all is that the recruitment and retention of first class librarians is adversely affected."[45] This strongly worded statement was, however, the product of the Librarians' Assembly, the body for library governance which Harvard developed.

One event which favored the work of the Study Committee was the founding of the University Librarians' Council. In the spring of 1970 the administrative officers of Harvard's "federal" system of libraries met as an ad hoc group. But later in the year the formal organization of the ULC and its regular monthly meetings meant that the Study Committee had an

administrative body to go to for approval, saving much time and allowing for critical review of drafts. Moreover, the Council could assure administrative approval.[46]

To overcome the principal difficulty of designing a workable plan of organization for a staff of over 230 librarians, widely dispersed physically, and functioning in virtually autonomous units, the Committee recommended in "Report Nº 1 (Revised)" that there be a Librarians' Assembly and an elected Librarians Senate. The objectives of the plan have the ring of both faculty systems and participative management.

> This plan of organization is intended to improve communications and promote more effective participation by members of the staff in affairs of the Library and the University, to provide for regular and continuous involvement of the staff in an effective review of policies and practices which affect them . . . . The proposed organization can usefully supplement--not replace--the existing administrative structure and the innumerable informal channels through which librarians are now communicating and participating as members of the Harvard Library community.[47]

The Harvard University Librarians' Assembly (who can resist the acronym HULA?) includes in its membership Corporation appointees (i.e. librarians) and all those enrolled in the professional internship program. Since the Assembly involves no representation, it is free to discuss and to vote on any subject. There is also adequate provision for it to consider any problem that the staff wants to discuss because ten members can request the formation of an ad hoc committee which must report to the Assembly. In addition, the Assembly makes it possible to determine staff opinion on questions such as priorities in a professional development program.

Administrative officers--Director, Personnel Officer, and the ULC--as well as chairmen of the University Library Committees report to the

Assembly, "Report Nº 1" provides for two meetings per year and special meetings called by ten per cent of the members or the Executive Committee. The presiding officer of the Assembly is the President of the University, and the vice-chairman is the Pforzheimer University Professor, who is also chairman of the DLC and of the Library Committee of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. Though membership and voting rights in the Assembly are limited to Corporation appointments, all members of the staff are admitted to meetings and committees of the libraries are encouraged to recruit any staff member interested in their work. Chairmen of the Standing Committees of the University Library comprise the membership of the Executive Committee of the Assembly. It is responsible for the "docket and distribution of the agenda."[48]

Because of its size and the distribution of its membership the Assembly cannot meet often or produce the kinds of studies and recommendations which require greater continuity. This was to have been the job of the Librarians' Senate, a small deliberative body elected from various districts in the Libraries. Unfortunately the plan could not be implemented due to difficulties related to rulings by the National Labor Relations Board.[49]

The other major portion of the governance system is the Standing Committees appointed by the Director. There are four: Communications and Orientation; Professional Development; Rights, Privileges and Responsibilities of Librarians; and Library Collections and Services. The Report also provides for the formation of ad hoc University Library committees to consider important matters affecting the libraries of more than one faculty.

They are composed by the appointment of the Director and in all cases where ten members of the professional staff recommend. Eligibility for appointment to these committees extends to all staff members including those who do not have Corporation appointments, and the Director is under obligation to include non-administrators and junior members of the staff in his selection of committees. The Study Committee felt that "local" problems would usually be more numerous and of greater moment to the staff than those problems affecting the Harvard University Library generally. Accordingly it was provided that "individual Harvard libraries and large departments within libraries consider the appointment of standing committees and the convening of general meetings for consideration of such problems."[50]

By July 1, 1973 all three of the Reports comprising the work of the Study Committee had been fully implemented.[51] The implementation of the Reports is succinctly described in the Annual Report for the year 1972-1973.[52]

In each of the systems of governance described here, the university library involved chose a two-track system combining some new departures in governance and superimposing them on the old hierarchical administrative system. Even UCLA's "revolutionary" scheme has an authoritative director, but various other administrative officers lack the usual line authority. At Harvard, more than any other school, it is difficult to see that the "communications" and "participation" of the librarians at large will make for a real difference. Nevertheless, from the first implementation of the plan the activities described in HUL Notes indicate a high level of librarian interest and participation. The strong statements adopted in the Third

Librarian's Assembly (February, 1974) [53] are clear evidence that the librarians are using the system seriously as a vehicle to voice their opinion and participate not only in the governance of the Library, but also to influence University wide policy. Perhaps the single strongest affirmation of the faith placed in the new system is the statement of the Study Committee in its final Report.

> We believe that new styles of management are developing--a more collegial system--and that this is even more important at the level of the individual department or library than at the University-wide level . . . . Library administrators must be well informed if the Library is to benefit from innovations in management theory and practice and if it is to experiment intelligently with such techniques as collegiality and rotation of administrative responsibility.[54]

From the first grant of faculty status at Texas A&M in September 1967 over six years were to elapse before the library faculty had established a system of governance. As often happens events moved people, and when the issue of tenure confronted TAMU librarians it forced them to consider the ancillary issue of organization of the library faculty. A committee of six charged with the responsibility of drafting the faculty bylaws and tenure statement operated from the premise that these should reflect both the mode of operation of teaching faculty and the special responsibilities, needs and duties of librarians. Interestingly, the committee considered the University of Minnesota and Oklahoma instruments,and found the ACRL statements of September 1973 helpful. Input from the library faculty meant that several preliminary drafts were necessary before the final draft of the Bylaws was ratified in November 1973.[55] Statements concerning initial appointment, promotion and tenure were developed later.

The Bylaws' definition of the faculty includes the Director and other

administrators who hold faculty rank, and librarians and others who hold professional appointments in the library. These members constitute the Voting Faculty of TAMU's Library, which has the most explicitly stated powers of governance of any of the institutions studied.[56]

> The Faculty shall participate in the conduct of the libraries' programs, in the development of the libraries' collections and in the establishment and implementation of standards for appointing, promoting and recommending continuing appointment for the Faculty.
>
> The Faculty . . . reserves to itself . . . the power to approve, by referendum, matters within its responsibility brought to it by the Director of Libraries, one of the committees, or by petition of ten percent (10%) of the Voting Faculty.[57]

The bi-monthly faculty meetings, presided over by the Director may be supplemented with special meetings called by him, the Chairman of the Executive Committee, or by a petition of twenty five per cent of the faculty. The Bylaws have in common with the other organizations considered here a provision for input into the agenda of meetings by the whole faculty and ample time to prepare for topics of discussion.[58] The provisions relative to building of an agenda require a sufficient amount of interchange of documentation and feedback as to constitute a major source of communication in themselves.

The workhorses of the TAMU faculty governance system are the three standing committees which are elected annually by secret vote of the Faculty. The Director and his immediate subordinates, Associate Directors and Assistant Directors, are the only members of the Voting Faculty not eligible for service on the standing committees, but the Director is an ex officio member of each. Here at least is a partial break with the normal pattern which thrusts the administrators of the older hierarchical structure into the heart of the new faculty structure. In this departure TAMU has deviated

somewhat from the norm. The requirements for composition of the committees, three tenured and two non-tenured faculty members, and the inclusion of faculty from both Public and Technical Services on each committee, insure a fairly broad distribution of representation. Restrictions against serving consecutive terms on a committee or concurrent terms on more than one further broaden the necessary base of participation. Characteristically, each of the committees is responsible for the election of its own officers.[59] In these provisions TAMU has followed established precedent.

Of the three standing committees, the Executive Committee is the representative body of the Faculty and its chairman serves as the presiding officer of the faculty meetings in the absence of the Director of Libraries. The functions of the Committee include serving as the spokesman for the Faculty; appointment and coordination of ad hoc committees; acting as a grievance committee; representing the faculty to the administration in the establishment of general library policy; advising the Director on all aspects of library service not within the purview of other standing committees; and presentation of quarterly reports to the faculty.[60]

The Committee on Library Planning and Programs has bi-monthly meetings with provisions for special meetings. Its functions include making recommendations for continuing programs and services, coordination of special inter-departmental programs, development of recommendations for new programs (including necessary staff requirements, development of recommendations concerning collections development (especially as regards future needs) and quarterly reports to the Faculty.[61] The Committee on Appointment Promotion and Tenure, also provided for in Article III, is discussed below.[62]

The Director's Council is a feature of the TAMU faculty governance system which reflects a number of the models used. It consists of the administrative staff who are faculty members, heads of the various departments and branches of the University's libraries, chairman of the Executive Committee, a representative from the Library Staff Association (non-professionals), and "other persons the Director may wish to include."[63] In its weekly meetings it serves as an advisory body to the Director and as a means of keeping the entire library staff informed on library matters. Its recorded minutes are distributed to the entire faculty.[64]

Librarians at A&M have also gained rights of participation in the faculty governance system of the whole University. They are eligible to serve on campus-wide faculty committees and also are represented in the University Senate with full voting rights.[65]

The continuing problem with each of the universities studied is that of judging the quality of communication under the new system and the actual influence of the faculty on decision making. The powers of the faculty have been described by Henry Alsmeyer the Associate Director. He states that "we are in a transition period, so that it is difficult to categorize. Each of the first four processes [decisions by top level administrators alone and acting with advice; decisions by group processes with administrators implementing them; and a system of standing committees and elected department heads making decisions jointly] are used to a degree."[66] As Texas A&M has moved to a faculty system, its librarians have acted more like faculty members in such areas as increased publications.[67] It is perhaps to be expected that this is the tip of the iceberg, and that establishing a faculty environment is the chief ingredient to stimulating faculty behavior.

REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER III

[1]"ACRL Academic Status Committee Proposes Standards for Librarians," College and Research Libraries News (October, 1970), 269-73. "Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians," College and Research Libraries News (June, 1971), 170-72. "Joint Statement on Faculty Status of College and University Librarians," College and Research Libraries News (September, 1972), 209-12. "Model Statement of Criteria and Procedures for Appointment, Promotion in Academic Rank, and Tenure for College and University Librarians," College and Research Libraries News (September, 1973), 192-95. "Appendixes to Model Statement of Criteria and Procedures for Appointment, Promotion in Academic Rank, and Tenure for College and University Librarians," College and Research Libraries News (October, 1973), 243-57.

[2]NOC Working Committee I, The Library Administrative Network Seminars. Working Paper, December 6, 1973, pp. 2-3. (Mimeographed.) (Hereinafter referred to as "Network Seminars.")

[3]Ibid., pp. 3-5.

[4]Ad Hoc Library Network Evaluation Committee (LANEC), The UCLA Library Administrative Network: An Evaluation Study, Submitted to Robert Vosper, University Librarian, Los Angeles, 1971, pp. 31-39. (Mimeographed.) (Hereinafter referred to as "Evaluation Study.")

[5]Network Seminars, p. 11.

[6]Charge to the Network Operations Committee, Final Document, December 31, 1971, p. 1. (Mimeographed.)

[7]Standing Rules for the Network Operations Committee, Final Document, December 13, 1971, p. 2. (Mimeographed.)

[8]Network Seminars, pp. 6-10.

[9]Evaluation Study, p. 14.

[10]Network Seminars, p. 10. The Personnel Committee has a broad charge including in its area of concern "all matters affecting library staff as a whole or groups of staff members." Specific attention is paid to classification and pay plans; staff training and development; general working conditions; fringe benefits; recruitment, selection, and appointment; evaluation and promotion; equal employment opportunities; appeals procedures; and security of employment. See Charge to the Personnel Committee, Revised January 1, 1971. (Mimeographed.)

[11]Charge to the Personnel Committee, Revised January 1, 1971. Charge to the Collection Development Committee, Revised September 30, 1970. Charge to the Public Services Committee, December 2, 1968. Charge to the Technical Processes Committee, Revised December 2, 1968. (Mimeographed.)

[12]Evaluation Study, p. 14.

[13]Network Seminars, p. 10.

[14]Ibid., pp. 11-13.

[15]Campus Appeals Procedure, UCLA, p. 1. (Mimeographed.)

[16]Letter from Arthur McAnnally, Director of University of Oklahoma Libraries, to Barbara Branson, Duke University Libraries, November 18, 1970. Letter from Arthur McAnnally, Director of University of Oklahoma Libraries, to Lois Bebout, University of Houston Libraries, October 26, 1971.

[17]Appendix, Rules of the University of Oklahoma Libraries Faculty, Revised June 17, 1971. Rules of the University of Oklhoma Faculties, Revised June 30, 1972. (Mimeographed.)

[18]University of Oklahoma Libraries, Norman Oklahoma, Minutes of the Faculty Meeting, meetings of February 22, 1968 to November 19, 1968. (Mimeographed.)

[19]McAnnally to Bebout.

[20]University of Oklahoma Libraries, Norman Oklahoma, Minutes of the Faculty Meeting, meeting of February 22, 1968, p. 2. (Mimeographed.)

[21]Rules of the University of Oklahoma Faculties, Revised June 30, 1972, Part I, II. (Mimeogrphed.)

[22]Robert A. De Young, "On the 'New' Library Staff Organization," MnU Bulletin, I (January, 1970), pp. 4-5.

[23]Ibid., pp. 1-4.

[24]University of Minnesota, University Libraries, Twin Cities Campus Constitution, Adopted by University Library Faculty, June 5, 1972, Approved by Board of Regents, September 8, 1972, art. II, sec. 1, Bylaws, sec 1. (Hereinafter referred to as "Twin Cities Campus Constitution.")

[25]Arthur M. McAnally and Robert B. Downs, "The Changing Role of Directors of University Libraries," College and Research Libraries, XXXIV (March, 1973), 118-19, footnote #56.

[26]Twin Cities Campus Constitution, art. I, sec. 2.

[27]Ibid., art. II, sec. 3.

[28]Ibid., art. II, sec. 4.

[29]Ibid., art. III, sec. 1, 2.

[30]Ibid., art. III, sec. 3.

[31]Ibid., art. III, sec. 4.

[32]Ibid., art. IV.

[33]Ibid., Bylaws, sec. 4.

[34]Ibid., art. V, sec. 1.

[35]Ibid., art. V, sec. 2.

[36]Ibid., art. V, sec. 4.

[37]Ibid., art. VII, VIII.

[38]Ralph Hopp, Annual Report of the University of Minnesota Libraries for the Year 1971-1972, University Libraries, Minneapolis.

[39]Robert A. De Young, "On the 'New' Library Staff Organization," pp. 1, 4.

[40]University of Minnesota Libraries, Library Faculty Memo, Faculty Assembly Minutes, meeting of September 19, 1972, p. 2, meeting of January 29, 1974, p. 2.

[41]Edwin E. Williams, "Harvard's Study Committee on Professional Library Personnel," Harvard Library Bulletin, XXI (July, 1973), 279-80. (Hereinafter referred to as "Harvard's Study Committee.")

[42]Ibid., pp. 280-82. The nine major headings which were included for study are professionalism; professional development; organization and staff structure; review and grievance; communication and participation; intern programs; salary levels in relation to other libraries and other professional groups at Harvard; the working conditions and fringe benefits; and permanent staff organization.

[43]Ibid., p. 279.

[44]Ibid., p. 287.

[45]"Third Librarians' Assembly," The Harvard Librarian, X (February-March, 1974), p. 3.

[46]Williams, "Harvard's Study Committee," p. 283.

[47]Ibid., pp. 295-96.

[48]Ibid., pp. 296-97, 298, footnote #23.

[49]Ibid., pp. 284-87.

[50]Ibid., pp. 296, 297.

[51]Letter from Philip E. Leinbach, Assistant University Librarian for Personnel, to Charles B. Lowry, June 17, 1974.

[52]Douglas W. Bryant and Louis E. Martin, Harvard University Library Annual Report for the Year 1972-1973, pp. 4-6.

[53]"Third Librarians' Assembly."

[54]Williams, "Harvard's Study Committee," p. 319.

[55]John B. Smith and Evelyn M. King, "Faculty Governance at the Texas A&M University Library," Texas Library Journal, L (March, 1974), 17-19. This article includes the various documents used at TAMU to promulgate faculty governance and status. See pp. 19, 44-46.

[56]Texas A&M University Libraries, Bylaws of the Library Faculty, Adopted November 14, 1973, art. I.

[57]Ibid., art. II.

[58]Ibid., art. III, sec. 1.

[59]Ibid., art. III, sec. 2.

[60]Ibid., art. III, sec. 3.

[61]Ibid., art. III, sec. 4.

[62]Ibid., art. III, sec. 5.

[63]Ibid., art. V, sec. 1.

[64]Ibid., art. V, sec. 2.

[65]Questionnaire circulated to Henry L. Alsmeyer, Jr., Associate Director of Texas A&M University Libraries, questions 13, 15.

[66]Ibid., question 16.

[67]The annual reports of both Texas A&M and the University of Minnesota illustrate what seems to be a marked increase of faculty scholarly activities as status is attained. To infer causality due to the implementation of faculty status would be to grossly simplify a dynamic situation in which advanced degrees and publications are encouraged in order to obtain faculty ranks.

IV APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE

Turning from governance to the issues of rights and privileges of library faculty, one is struck by the interlocking system of requirements which the ACRL standrds propose. Nevertheless appointment promotion and tenure can be examined as separate issues, saving termination and grievance procedures, compensation, leaves, research funds and academic freedom for last. In its proposals for appointment, promotion in rank, and tenure the ACRL calls for a system which is peer oriented. Initial appointments should include review by the library faculty or a committee representative of them with power to make recommendations. Procedures for selection are to be the same as for all faculty, as are initial terms of employment, which should be in writing or contract form if that method is used. The appropriate terminal degree for hiring librarians is the MLS, or its antecedant in library schools (e.g. five year BS).

Because the ACRL "criterion for tenure are closely allied to the criteria for promotion in academic rank" they should be discussed in tandem. The premier ACRL requirement here is that librarians have the same titles, ranks and steps as the other academic faculty. The general professional and scholarly qualifications for library faculty are established on the basis of the terminal professional degree, and the first quality for promotion is the performance at a high professional level in areas of librarianship contributing to the educational and research mission of the college or university. These include reference services, collection development, and

bibliographic organization and control. The evidence of such performance may be adduced from a number of sources including library faculty colleagues, other members of the academic community, and colleagues outside academic institutions. Additional evidence of competence may include contributions to the educational function such as teaching (not necessarily in the classroom) workshops, public appearances and the like; contributions to the advancement of the profession of librarianship such as active participation in learned societies; and activities attributable to research--publications, presentation of papers, and consulting.

The ACRL standards also present criteria for promotion in specific ranks. Instructor appointments should demonstrate successful overall performance of work and potential for career growth. Assistant professors should give evidence of significant contributions to the library, the institution, or both. Associate professors are expected to demonstrate not only these qualities, but also evidence of high level bibliographic activity in research or other professional endeavors. Full professors are obligated to show outstanding achievements in all the areas of activity demanded of the other three ranks.

Procedures recommended by the ACRL for promotion to specific ranks are not merely "procedural matters" since they involve the whole scheme of participation upon which the authority of the faculty is based. In addition, they reflect the concept of due process which is a fundamental aspect of faculty governance and participation. The standards call for a peer review system similar to that used by other faculty as the primary basis for promotion. It includes features such as standing or ad hoc peer review committees in accord with institutional regulations. Recommendations for

promotion may come from appropriate department heads, assistant and associate directors, or any member of the library faculty. Documentation in support of candidacy must include evaluations by superiors and may include letters from colleagues, copies of publications and records of professional activities. Tenure, evaluation, and review procedures are to be conducted at the same time as for other academic faculty. Final recommendations of peer review committees are transmitted to the appropriate administrative officer by the library administration and there must be appeal of negative decisions where there is sufficient grounds for disagreement.

Once again in the case of tenure, the ACRL standards demand that library faculty be subject to the same regulations as other faculty, and that in the pretenure period they be covered by contracts or agreements the same as other faculty. Tenure is defined as a commitment by the institution to continuous and permanent employment of the individual faculty member with termination only for adequate cause and only after due process. The criteria are closely allied to those for promotion with candidates being reviewed according to institutional procedures applied to other faculty.[1]

Although UCLA's librarians do not have faculty status, the requirements for appointment are similar in form to initial faculty appointments. In accord with the ACRL standards they require a minimum of an MLS from an ALA accredited school. At the same time distinctions are clearly drawn in the Acadmic Personnel Manual, Librarian Series between beginning librarians with no previous experience, those with special training and/or previous experience, and those with "extensive previous relevant experience and superior qualifications." These distinctions are the basis for differentiating

among appointments to various ranks and the salary levels within those ranks.[2] There are also ample provisions for review of qualified prospective appointees by a committee representative of the librarians. This Committee for Peer Evaluation also makes recommendations for promotion and permanent appointment.[3]

Obviously, in a library which does not have faculty rank, the ACRL standards are not completely fulfilled. However, a structure parallel to faculty ranks--Assistant Librarian, Associate Librarian, and Librarian--has been implemented.[4] Moreover, the procedures and criteria for promotion read like a paraphrase of the ACRL model. The ACRL emphasis on general qualifications which contribute to the research and educational mission of the institution are clearly stated,[5] as are the sources of evidence for competency relevant to promotion--faculty colleagues, library colleagues, and library administration. This basic framework for considering possible promotion includes professional competence and quality of service within the library, professional activity outside the library, university and public service, research and other creative activity.[6]

UCLA's Academic Personnel Manual elaborates the general requirements for committees which review appointments, merit increases, promotion and permanent appointment.[7] These procedures are rationalized for the library, in the "Procedures for Personnel Actions on Appointees in the Librarians Series at UCLA," which has as its central feature the Committee for Peer Evaluation. This is a standing committee of the Librarians Association of UCLA, which is a functional part of the Library Administrative

Network. As with the roster of librarians eligible for appointment to LAN's Staff Resource Committees, provision has been made for the broadest possible representation of librarians on the Committee for Peer Evaluation, which constitutes the pool from which ad hoc committees are drawn to consider specific cases. These provisions accord with ACRL recommendations as do those calling for recommendations and documentation from unit heads.

The similarity to the standards is further underscored by provisions for appeal by the candidate in case of negative decisions.[8] An unusual feature of the UCLA evaluation procedures is a recent addition to the Academic Personnel Manual of a section for Associate and Assistant University Librarians.[9] These procedures, covering appointment, promotion, and merit increases, provide for the formation of committees to "advise or assist in the search for candidates and in the review of personnel actions affecting titles in this series. However, such procedures are to be separate from and independent of procedures applicable to appointees in the librarian series."[10]

Though it is not possible to speak of tenure in the context of UCLA's Libraries, there is a provision for continuing appointments, career appointment, which is like a tenured faculty position. In addition, there are appointments characterized as "explicitly" temporary appointments and "potential" career appointments. The UCLA appointment system provides for annual review of performance; judgement of professional competence, achievement and promise; and promotion within given time period of four to six years. These requirements along with those for "up or out" decisions make the conditions of appointment similar to those normally expected for

faculty. Likewise, the fact that an appointee has career status in the Associate Librarians rank places the University under no obligation to promote that person to the rank of Librarian. In short, a librarian who does not show substantial professional growth may remain a "junior professor" with "tenure."[11]

In light of the foregoing discussion it seems obvious that it is possible for a library to substantially fulfill the ACRL requirements for faculty rank, appointment, promotion and tenure without actually achieving full faculty status. The obvious shortcoming of this sort of solution is that the librarians may not be considered by the academic faculty as peers. However, this is not necessarily the case.

The University of Oklahoma Libraries, on the other hand, are organized as a non-departmentalized college and the librarians have full faculty status and rank. Therefore, they operate as individuals and as a faculty according to the Handbook for Faculty Members of the University of Oklahoma. This means that OU fulfills the ACRL guidelines of establishing its appointment, promotion and tenure procedures on the same basis as the academic faculty. In the implementation of the general provisions of the Handbook the Library Faculty has from time to time passed clarifying resolutions which are periodically updated in the Rules of the Univerity of Oklahoma Faculty. The Oklahoma attitude towards appointments may be indicative of what happens when librarians become faculty. Beyond the basic requirement of an MLS, in recent years appointments and promotions have tended to be tied in practice to the possession of advanced degrees, though this is not an explicit requirement.[12]

The Library Faculty is empowered by the Rules to make recommendations on new staff appointments. A fairly standard procedure is to give first opportunity for a position to OU staff members. It is then the duty of Committee A--two members elected from the library Faculty and the Director--to screen applicants and present candidates to the Faculty as a whole. At least a two-thirds majority of the faculty is required to make an appointment. In addition, the rules offer the caveat that positions should be filled with an eye to securing representation from a wide variety of library schools.[13]

The criterion for promotion at OU are nowhere better stated than by the late Arthur McAnally. "We pushed everyone very hard to secure advanced degrees, promoted and encouraged professional research and publication, stressed services to the profession and university, urged memberships and participation in ACRL and AAUP and O.L.A., made no promotions or new appointments without advanced degrees, pushed people to acquire more languages, and to conduct ourselves as a faculty."[14] The Rules make specific reference to teaching, which for librarians is interpreted as sucessful performance of library duties; evidence of productive research and artistic creations, which may include administrative studies of library problems and also special studies or enrollment in classes by individual librarians; and evidence of service to the profession, State or University, which includes welfare of students, committee service, participation in professional organizations and civic works.

Personnel data must be obtained from each staff member annually, and when a member of the staff is being considered for promotion there is a ballot of the whole faculty holding either the rank to which the promotion may be made or a higher one. Committee A acts upon the advice

of the ballot. The requirements for tenure are closely related to those for promotion. Committee A has the responsibility of presenting names of persons who are eligible for tenure in accordance with the rules laid down in the Faculty Handbook. The faculty makes its recommendation concerning the individual cases according to general faculty pratice.[15]

There is a clear contrast in the brevity of OU's procedures for appointment, promotion and tenure compared to similar requirements at UCLA. This results from the fact that the Library Faculty found a system already in place upon which to base its procedures. Here is an advantage which is not available to libraries which build personnel systems parallel to full faculty status.

Minnesota, like Oklahoma, has accepted the principal of full faculty status for librarians with the consequence that the Library Faculty has been able to use the faculty standards for appointment, promotion and tenure as the basis for the recruiting and advancement of its professional librarians. The "Bylaws" to the Constitution do not elaborate the qualifications for initial appointment, but explicate only procedural matters. Presumeably, the minimum educational experience of an MLS from an accredited ALA institution, required for promotion in rank and for tenure, is also requisite for appointment.[16]

The Committee on Faculty Personnel, discussed earlier, provides a roster from which the Director appoints an ad hoc search committee for each academic vacancy. The ad hoc committee, in consultation with the Director, department chairman and other concerned persons, establishes the qualifications for the position to be filled. Under its broad charge the Committee

also considers applications and makes recommendations to the Director for final action.

Appropriate to the ACRL standards, the "Bylaws" also provide that promotion in academic rank and grant of tenure must be consistent with University requirements for both. The Committee on Faculty Personnel is responsible for recommending appropriate procedures and accordingly in early 1973 presented its draft which was accepted by the faculty with few revisions.[17] The general requirements call for a demonstrated commitment to the goals of teaching, research and public service. Criteria for tenure and promotion closely relate. In addition to the minimum requirement of an MLS or equivalent work experience, candidates should have demonstrated competence in their field of work, exceptional professional growth, and must have achieved an educational level above the minimum required. Specific criteria include demonstration of contributions in one or more of the following areas: improvement of library service; instructional work in an academic department; compiling of bibliographical aids, indexes, or information retrieval programs; significant research and publication in an academic discipline; and outstanding managerial work or contributions to academic organization.

In the matter of procedural requirements for tenure nomination, the Committees recommendations provide for broad participation. The department head, the individual seeking tenure or promotion, or any five or more Library Faculty members may initiate candidacy. The department head or the appropriate administrative officer must prepare the documentation, which may be supplemented by material from the nominee. Department heads or individuals send tenure recommendations or applications for tenure and promotion

to the Committee, which forwards them to the Director who convenes those eligible to vote.[18] "Candidates for promotion to the ranks indicated above and for tenure must receive a simple majority of the votes of those voting with abstentions recorded."[19]

The extension of tenure to librarians is not without ancillary problems. At Minnesota the Director and Assistant Directors have had academic rank for over twenty years. Tenure has been extended incrementally by adding first eleven tenured positions at the assistant professor level for departments heads and then an additional forty three positions in 1963.

These latter positions were principally filled at the instructor level. This distribution is rather distorted and can only be worked out with time. In addition, there are always problems when adding ranked positions, which are related to the need for funding at higher salary levels.[20] Finally, it is necessary to adjust the library system to meet the changing requirements of the university. For instance, the proposed change in the University tenure code eliminating tenured positions for instructors jeopardized the whole lower strata of the ranked library faculty. Simple problems in paperwork and file maintenance can also be troublesome.[21] Such difficulties are not peculiar to Minnesota, but should be expected in any institution which moves to full faculty status. These are problems which the parallel system does not always face.

Of the libraries under consideration, Harvard's conforms least to the ACRL model statements in the matters of appointment, promotion in rank and tenure. It is, nonetheless, a system which recognizes non-administrative talents and contributions, but one which is not "a system of faculty status

and ranks, nor . . . a 'peer evaluation' procedure of the kind that usually accompanies faculty status."[22] The standard credential for a starting position at Harvard is the MLS, but consideration is given to graduate training in other fields and to suitable experience. Generally the librarian with no experience is appointed to the Librarian I rank. The beginning librarian usually works under close supervision within the parameters of established procedures and policies, but with supervision lessening as experience is gained. In the case of appointment, as with promotion, there has been no provision for participative decision making in the Harvard design.[23]

Harvard's ranking system parallels that of the faculty and updates the 1958 scheme. The purpose for the new system is the removal of inequities between libraries in salary structure and the clarification of the 1958 ranking system which was not sufficiently clear to Harvard librarians. Librarians are assigned the ranks of Librarian I, II, and III and are "Corporation appointees." Specific positions may tend to be filled with Librarian I's, but the ranking system is not intended to reduce flexibility in promotions for a position. The possibility of expanding the role of a position is to be kept open, though in some cases changing positions may be necessary for advancement. Nevertheless, ranks are held by individuals and not assigned to positions.[24]

Criteria for promotion in specific ranks are discernable in the definition of and criteria for appointment. These imply, moreover, some of the ACRL principles. The Librarian II, for instance, is one whose work requires some specialization--linguistic, technical, subject, or administrative--and who takes responsibility, under general direction, for the develop-

ment and implementation of new policies, services, and programs. Duties characteristic of this position are supervision of a small or mid-sized units; advanced reference or bibliographical work; collection development; and application of special techniques. Appointment is based on proven competence observed over a number of years.

Librarian III's are expected to have mastery of an area of librarianship. Their duties may include supervision of a mid or large size unit, collection development, technical processing, management, systems planning, or specialized bibliographical and reference work, Such persons work independently and have general responsibility for results. The appointee normally has demonstrated professional growth in one of these areas over a nine year period.[25] General qualifications for Harvard librarians also have more than a passing similarity to ACRL and accordingly emphasize a "broad understanding of libraries and their services to teaching and research . . . . Special knowledge of one or more subjects . . . . knowledge of one or more languages other than English . . . . [or] administrative ability."[26] In consideration to superior performance on the job, consideration is also given to professional growth and activities such as further course work, improved linguistic skills, membership in professional associations, committee work, office holding, and presentation of papers; research and publication; and service to the university community.[27]

Of the universities under consideration Harvard's system is the most administratively oriented in matters of procedures for review and promotion. It demands systematic review as an essential to the Library and the individual and requires that personnel decisions be made at

specific times so that they will not be dodged. For each rank there are requirements for review by the supervisor and an interview with the appropriate personnel librarian.

At the Librarian I level these procedures require a review and decision whether to reappoint after the initial year and then for a second two year term. At the end of that period a decision must be made to appoint as a Librarian II or terminate. The up or out decision requires the opinions of at least two other persons selected on a basis of contacts the position involves. This is the only provision for peer participation. The Librarian II position requires written evaluation after one year; interview, substantial review by department head, and two other opinions after two; and continued evaluations and decisions to appoint as Librarian III or continue as Librarian II at intervals of 2 1/2, 3, 4, 4 1/2, and 5 years. The five year evaluation must result in appointment without limit of time as a Librarian II or III, or termination. The most important feature of Harvard's promotion scheme is that the procedures call for a review and decisions based on interviews by supervisors and personnel administrators. This means that the imput required from other sources is at the mercy of the good will of superiors not peers. The chief safeguard against abuse is that the administrators are required to discuss their reviews in detail with each employee, and present their criticisms in writing. Where problems arise the department heads are charged with the responsibility of resolving them and failing in this they are passed to the Library Personnel Office. Harvard's version of tenure is "appointment without limit of time." A librarian who holds this appointment is "assured that his employment by the University will continue until

he reaches retirement age unless he is guilty of 'grave misconduct' of his 'duties are not satisfactorily discharged'"[28]

It is evident that the faculty model had influence on Harvard's ranking and governance systems alike. Yet the ranking system lacks the important ingredient of true review. Harvard librarians have stated repeatedly that the faculty model did not serve their needs and that they would be better satisfied with a system designed specifically for the libraries.[29] This goal is not in itself arguable. However, the position has been taken that it behooves librarians to ally themselves with the most powerful group on campus, the faculty.[30] At Harvard failure to do this has recently led to decisions on a University wide basis, concerning review and fringe benefits, in which the librarians had little say and to which they strongly objected.[31]

Initial appointment at Texas A&M must be in accord with the regulations established for all faculty and the degree requirement is an MLS from an ALA accredited institution, but no experience. The usual procedure when vacancies occur is to first inform the Library Faculty and after the appropriate assistant director provides job descriptions the director accepts applications, reviews them with the persons concerned and forwards them to the Committee on Appointment, Promotion and Tenure. The Committee reviews the applicant's records and submits to the Director its recommendation of candidates who should be interviewed. The Director is ultimately responsible for making appointments in "accordance with University regulations."[32]

TAMU's criteria and procedures for promotion in rank are clear example of what the ACRL standards call for and are the same as those for

other academic faculty as set forth in the University's Policy and Procedures Manual. The Library Faculty has established a number of special provisions.[33] These policies were established separately from the Faculty Bylaws and are closely related to those for tenure. The first criteria considered is performance as demonstrated by successful handling of the responsibilities of the job, including instruction and guidance, bibliographic and other professional skills, supervisory work, and personal characteristics relative to performance--interpersonal relations, innovativeness initiative, and the like. Professional service to the Library, the university community and the community at large are also considered. Such services may include committee work in the library or university. Reckoned to this is professional growth and scholarly endeavors, including publication in librarianship or other fields, continuing education, additional degrees, and participation in scholarly and professional organizations.

TAMU has established minimum criteria for promotion to specific ranks above Instructor. Assistant professors usually have a PhD or equivalent degree or master's with four years experience including four years at TAMU. However, fulfilling the experience requirement does not automatically gurantee promotion in rank. The Associate professor is expected to have eight years experience, four at TAMU, and like the Assistant Professor should have demonstrated ability in performance of work, a definite record of professional qualifications and evidence of continued professional growth. Associate Professors must also make "significant contributions to the library, including assistance to junior staff members in performance of their duties and in their development; contributions to the University; [and] attainment of high level of activity ther professional endeavors."[34]

Professors should have twelve years of pertinent experience, six at TAMU. Besides the requirements of the lower ranks, Professors are expected to demonstrate comprehensive knowledge of their fields; scholarship and knowledge of their profession recognized by colleagues at A&M and elsewhere.[35] Relevant to the question of promotion is the fact that it is not tied to becoming an administrator. In addition, there are no restrictions on places where publications may appear and excellence in librarianship is not equated directly with teaching.[36]

The peer review system of Texas A&M University Library is embodied in a standing Committee of the Library Faculty--the Committee on Appointment, Promotion and Tenure--which meets semi-annually and has provisions for special meetings. Its functions include policy and procedure recommendations in its area of competence; advising the Director on all tenure recommendations (a function of the tenured members of the committee); review and evaluation of the Director's recommendations for merit increases; recommendations to the Library Council and the Vice President for Academic Affairs concerning appointments to the office of Director of Libraries; and semi-annual reports to the Faculty.[37]

The procedural steps for promotion in rank at A&M are in very close conformity with the ACRL standards. Formal requests may come from the proper assistant or associate director, the Director, or any member of the Library Faculty. The Committee on Appointment, Promotion and Tenure is provided each year with data sheets of candidates and further documentation in support of candidacy must include evaluations of department head, associate director, assistant director and Director. Additional documen-

tation may include letters from colleagues, publications and other pertinent documents selected by the candidate. The Committee reviews these materials and prepares a report for each candidate advising the Director of its recommendations. The Director must then confer with each candidate and advise him of the final decision.[38] No provision for appeal appears in these guidelines.

Tenure for Texas A&M librarians and academic faculty means that an experienced faculty member who has passed his probationary term can expect to continue his academic position unless substantial cause for dismissal is shown in a fair hearing following procedures of due process. Each year the candidates for tenure supply a vita which describes their activities and plans for future professional growth. These are considered evidence for promotion. The Subcommittee on tenure of the Committee on Appointment Promotion and Tenure (i.e. tenured members of the Committee) reviews the documentation and makes a report of its recommendations for each candidate to the Director. The Director must then confer with each candidate communicating the recommendations which will be submitted to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.[39] It should be noted that this system of peer review does not provide for active participation of the entire Library Faculty. However, the election of the Committee does allow each faculty member the opportunity to make his influence felt.

In the main, the TAMU system of ranks, appointment, promotion and tenure conforms admirably to the recommendations of the ACRL. This should not be surprising in view of the fact that the system was developed using a number of early experiments in faculty governance and the ACRL standards as a model. This experience indicates that university libraries may in the

future be able to follow such a pattern and draw up their own standards for governance and full faculty status quickly. The full implementation of such systems will, however, be a more time consuming process involving the full effort of all staff members.

REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER IV

[1]"ACRL Academic Status Committee Proposes Standards for Librarians," College and Research Libraries News (October, 1970), 269-73. "Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians," College and Research Libraries News (June, 1971), 170-72. "Joint Statement on Faculty Status of College and University Librarians," College and Research Libraries News (September, 1972), 209-12. "Model Statement of Criteria and Procedures for Appointment, Promotion in Academic Rank, and Tenure for College and University Librarians," College and Research Libraries News (September, 1973), 192-95. "Appendixes to Model Statement of Criteria and Procedures for Appointment, Promotion in Academic Rank, and Tenure for College and University Librarians," College and Research Libraries News (October, 1973), 243-57.

[2]"Librarian Series: Appointment and Promotion," Academic Personnel Manual, sec. 51-4 e.(1). (Hereinafter referred to as "Librarian Series.")

[3]Office of the Librarian, Procedure for Personnel Actions on Appointees in the Librarians Series at UCLA, Los Angeles, March, 1974, pp. 1-3. (Hereinafter referred to as "Procedures for Personnel Actions.") (Mimeographed.)

[4]Librarian Series, sec. 82-10.

[5]Ibid., sec. 82-4.

[6]Ibid., sec. 54-4 e.(3).

[7]Ibid., sec. 51-4.

[8]Procedure for Personnel Actions, pp. 1-7. Reference should be made here to the Personnel Committee of LAN, which is the major vehicle for staff input into policy making. This Committee's responsibilities are broadly enough based to include a great variety of staff concerns.

[9]Librarian Series, sec. 83.

[10]Ibid., sec. 83-80.

[11]Ibid., sec. 82-17.

[12]Letter from Arthur McAnally Director of University of Oklahoma Libraries, to Lois Bebout, University of Houston Libraries, October 26, 1971.

[13]Rules of the University of Oklahoma Faculties, Revised June 30, 1972, pp. 2, 5-6. Since 1973 the balloting for new appointments has been secret. See University of Oklahoma Libraries, Norman Oklahoma, Minutes of the Faculty Meeting, meeting of September 20, 1973. (Mimeographed.)

[14]McAnally to Bebout.

[15]Rules of the University of Oklahoma Faculties, pp. 2, 5.

[16]University of Minnesota Library, Twin Cities Campus, Criteria for Tenure and Promotion of Library Faculty, Adopted by Library Faculty January 24, 1973, pp. 1-2. (Mimeographed.)

[17]University of Minnesota, University Libraries, Twin Cities Campus Constitution, Adopted by University Library Faculty, June 5, 1972, Approved by Board of Regents, September 8, 1972, art. V, sec. 4, Bylaws, sec. 7.

[18]University of Minnesota Library, Criteria for Tenure and Promotion of Library Faculty, pp. 1-2.

[19]University of Minnesota Libraries, Library Faculty Memo, Faculty Assembly Minutes, meeting of January 24, 1973. (Mimeographed.)

[20]Letter from Ralph H. Hopp, Director of University of Minnesota Libraries, to Edward G. Holley, Dean of University of North Carolina School of Library Science, May 3, 1973.

[21]University of Minnesota Libraries, Faculty Assembly Minutes, meetings of January 29, 1974 and April 30, 1974.

[22]Edwin E. Williams, "Harvard's Study Committee on Professional Library Personnel," Harvard Library Bulletin, XXI (July, 1973), p. 299. (Hereinafter referred to as "Harvard's Study Committee.")

[23]Ibid., pp. 304, 311. Definitions of Librarian Ranks and Criteria of Appointment. (Mimeographed.)

[24]Williams, "Harvard's Study Committee," pp. 299, 307.

[25]Definitions of Librarian Ranks and Criteria of Appointment, Librarian I, II.

[26]Williams, "Harvard's Study Committee," p. 310.

[27]Ibid., p. 309.

[28]Ibid., pp. 299, 301, 303-4, 308. Harvard College Library, Guidelines for Completion of Personnel Evaluation Form.

[29]Williams, "Harvard's Study Committee," pp. 287, 288, 299.

[30]Edward G. Holley, "Who Runs Libraries? The Emergence of Library Governance in Higher Education," Wilson Library Bulletin, IIL (September, 1973), p. 48.

[31]"Third Librarians Assembly," The Harvard Librarian, X (February-March, 1974), p. 3. Douglas W. Bryant and Louis E. Martin, Harvard Univer-

sity Library Annual Report for the Year 1972-1973, p. 5.

[32]Texas A&M University Libraries, Statement on Promotion in Academic Rank for Texas A&M Univeristy Libraries, Adopted February 14, 1974. Questionnaire circulated to Henry L. Alsmeyer, Jr., Associate Director of Texas A&M University Libraries, question 6.

[33]Faculty Tenure Statement for Texas A&M University Libraries.

[34]Ibid.

[35]Ibid.

[36]Questionnaire circulated to Henry L. Alsmeyer, questions 2, 8, 9.

[37]Texas A&M University Libraries, Bylaws of the Library Faculty, Adopted November 14, 1973, art. III, sec. 5.

[38]Statement on Promotion in Academic Rank for Texas A&M University Libraries.

[39]Faculty Tenure Statement for Texas A&M University Libraries.

V RESIDUALS--TERMINATION AND GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES, COMPENSATION, LEAVES, RESEARCH FUNDS AND ACADEMIC FREEDOM

There are five other principal areas with which the ACRL standards concern themselves. Termination and grievance procedures are typically to be the same as those for all faculty, clearly stated and based on due process. The due process requirement is one which is elaborately developed in the "Appendixes to Model Statement of Criteria and Procedures for Appointment, Promotion in Academic Rank, and Tenure for College and University Librarians." However, for the purposes of this paper only the key issue of due process--involving principles such as the right to confront witnesses, presentation of written documentation, and the like--will be considered.

Compensation for librarians is to be the same as for other academic faculty categories with equivalent education and experience and there should be an academic year appointment and additional compensation for summer work. The standards recommend also that leaves such as sabbaticals and specific research leaves should be available to librarians on a par with other faculty. So should research funds. A final reflection of the faculty system in the ACRL standards is the requirement that librarians have the same protections as teaching faculty with regard to academic freedom and censorship. This recognizes the librarians' important role in the educational enterprise,[1] and reflects the long standing position of the ALA.

Of the materials available to this author for comparison with the ACRL standards, the most diffuse were related to the topics discussed in this section. The development of this chapter is perforce spotty. However, it is possible to arrive at some conclusions concerning the effects which the various systems have on termination and grievance procedures, compensation, leaves, research funds and academic freedom.

In the non-faculty systems considered the differences with the standards stood out in clearest relief with regard to these issues. At UCLA most relevant activities fall within the purview of the Personnel Committee, a Staff Resource Committee, of LAN. However, this is a policy recommending body and does not concern itself with the problems of individual members of the staff. The Committee is concerned with classification and pay plans, staff training and development, general working conditions, fringe benefits, and appeals procedures. It is representative of the staff and administration as a whole and, therefore, offers substantial means for expression of general faculty opinion.[2]

The "Campus Appeals Procedure" for academic appointees other than members of the Academic Senate (i.e. teaching faculty) is applicable to librarians. It calls for strong efforts to resolve differences informally before initiating the formal investigation. The provisions of the "Procedure" allow the appointee direct access to the Chancellor who initiates the review procedures through the appropriate chairman, or other department head. If this step is inconclusive there is a provision for a formal hearing before an ad hoc committee which makes recommendations to the Chancellor for final decision. There is also ample requirement for due process, open documentation, and appropriate limits of time.[3] These procedures are protection against arbitrary or unwarranted termination

and are specifically referred to in the "Terms of Service" for the Librarians Series.[4]

"The salary structure for the Librarian Series does not presently stipulate normal periods of service at the various salary levels, but it is anticipated that a new salary scale, with this feature included, will be introduced as soon as circumstances permit."[5] Obviously librarian's salaries will not be pegged to those of the academic faculty. One important benefit granted to UCLA librarians is leave of absence with full or partial salary. Such a leave is granted when it is related to the appointee's duties or professional growth, and when the project is directly related to the library or university, but is limited by the availability of funds.[6]

At Oklahoma grievance procedures were developed for all the library staff by the Committee on Grievance Procedures. Not unexpectedly, the procedures call for every effort at informal resolution of difficulties within a department, but failing in that allow any employee to have a hearing by an "impartial ad hoc committee." Faculty complaints are handled by Faculty "A" Committee with provision for alternates and substitutes when necessary. Problems concerning tenure may be brought before the Committee without prejudice to the right of appeal to the University Committee on Faculty personnel. There are also provisions for appeals by both classified staff and students. Membership of committees for hearing grievances is restricted so that no concerned party may be on a committee. Ample regard is given to oral and written arguments, due process, and confidentiality. The recommendations of such committees are forwarded to the Director for action.[7]

"Promotions and salary raises are passed on by a committee consisting of the dean [Director] and two elected members of the faculty, though recommendations from department heads are sought."[8] Moreover, "salaries . . . [are] on the same basis as academic faculty salaries"[9] In the area of vacations, library faculty are awarded the same time off as academic faculty members, but with due regard for the scheduling needs of the library. An important point is that the Rules emphasize breaks between sessions are not holidays or vacation but times which should be utilized by the faculty for professional growth or research.[10] The library faculty also has available sources of support for research and professional growth or research.[11] Thus OU has evolved a system of benefits which conforms closely with what is expected by most university faculties.

The Bylaws of the Minnesota Constitution provide for a Subcommittee on Appeals and Grievances, which concerns itself with academic staff and consists of three members of the Faculty Personnel Committee, appointed by the chairman. It is empowered to receive written grievance statements concerning promotion, tenure and salary and to establish ad hoc committees to carry on investigations in specific cases. Recommendations are transmitted to the Director. Provisions for confidentiality and appeal of decisions are provided for by the Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure.

Recommendations concerning salary adjustments are made by department heads after appropriate consultation. The Director makes formal recommendations to the University administration which then may be reviewed by the Committee on Faculty Personnel. The Committee may make recommendations to the Director for adjustment in specific cases and the individual concerned may file grievances.[12] In its deliberations the Committee on Faculty

Personnel seeks to establish salaries which accord both with the academic faculty and with other equivalent library positions in the Twin Cities area. However, the most recent evidence shows that the librarians at Minnesota have not yet reached equivalence with academic faculty in such matters as travel money.[13]

The hiatus which exists at Minnesota between academic and library faculty in such matters as benefits is typical of the implementation period. Once the major tasks of establishing governance, ranks, and procedures for both areas has been achieved, it falls to the library faculty at any school to attack the myriad of related issues which must be dealt with before faculty status has its fullest meaning.

At Harvard general University grievance procedures are applied to librarians. The recently revised plan is principally the work of Professor James J. Healy of the Business School.[14] It places emphasis on exhausting all informal procedures for handling employee problems. Failing in solution, the employee may request a formal review. In cases of dismissal, discipline, or alleged discrimination the first step is review by the employees supervisor and, if the employee remains unsatisfied, by the Dean or other appropriate administrative officer. After these steps a special hearing panel of three members may be composed, one chosen by the employee, one by the Dean and a third by these two from a roster of seven people connected with Harvard and having arbitration experience. This panel's decision is final and binding except in cases of administrative and professional personnel, in which case the recommendations are forwarded to the President for decision. Grievances involving benefits are reviewed by the Benefits committee and those involving job classification by procedures set

in the Personnel Manual.[15]

The well developed plan of benefits and compensation at Harvard is accompanied by the most comprehensive approach to staff development issued by any of the universities studied. This plan is embodied in the "Report N°3 Professional Development and Participation." At Harvard the fringe benefits available to academic faculty are in most cases made available to those librarians serving "without limit of time." Salaries are integrally related to the ranking system and are reviewed and published annually.[16] The present salary schedule reflects well on the workability of the system: Librarian I, $9,400-11,550; Librarian II, $11,750-17,250; and Librarian III, $13,800-Open.[17] That is, the ranges are acceptable.

The Report deals with a broad range of topics: continuing professional education, including orientation, institutes and seminars, meetings of library and academic organizations, academic courses, fellowships, and leaves (paid and unpaid); research by librarians; communication, including various staff meetings, committees and publications; participation, also including staff meetings, committees, and publications; and a proposal for an experiment with liaison librarians to develop communications between academic faculties and the library.[18] Much space could be devoted to the description of this Report. Suffice it to say, that here the intent of Harvard librarians to develop a parallel system of professional organization, reflecting the best traditions of scholarly endeavor and fitting their particular needs, rings truest.

The Library Faculty of Texas A&M University is governed in its general grievance procedures by the same policies as other University facul-

ties. Dismissal must be accompanied by proof of adequate cause shown in a fair hearing which follows established University procedures. Such an arrangement is in accord with the ACRL guidelines.[19]

TAMU attempts to set salary ranges for librarians which conform to national norms. Vacation and holiday periods for librarians are the same as regular academic faculty, and so are pensions, hospitalization, insurance and other benefits. Finally research funds are available on the same basis as those for teaching faculty.[20]

REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER V

[1]"ACRL Academic Status Committee Proposes Standards for Librarians," College and Research Libraries News (October, 1970), 269-73. "Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians," College and Research Libraries News (June, 1971), 170-72. "Joint Statement of Faculty Status of College and University Librarians," College and Research Libraries News (September, 1972), 209-12. "Model Statement of Criteria and Procedures for Appointment, Promotion in Academic Rank, and Tenure for College and University Librarians," College and Research Libraries News (September, 1973), 192-95. "Appendixes to Model Statement of Criteria and Procedures for Appointment, Promotion in Academic Rank, and Tenure for College and University Librarians," College and Research Libraries News (October, 1973), 243-57.

[2]Charge to the Personnel Committee, Revised January 1, 1971.

[3]Campus Appeals Procedure, UCLA. (Mimeogrphed.)

[4]"Librarian Series: Appointment and Promotion," Academic Personnel Manual, sec. 82-17.

[5]Ibid., footnote to section 82-18.

[6]Ibid., sec. 82-18, 82-20.

[7]Rules of the University of Oklahoma Faculties, Revised June 30, 1972, Part III.

[8]Letter from Arthur McAnally, Director of University of Oklahoma Libraries, to Lois Bebout, University of Houston Libraries, October 26, 1971.

[9]University of Oklahoma Libraries, Norman Oklahoma, Minutes of the Faculty Meeting, meeting of September 22, 1967, p. 1.

[10]Rules of the University of Oklahoma Faculties, Part III.

[11]Annual Report, the University of Oklahoma Libraries, Fiscal Year 1972/73, p. 3.

[12]University of Minnesota, University Libraries, Twin Cities Campus Constitution, Adopted by University Library Faculty, June 5, 1972, Approved by Board of Regents, September 8, 1972, Bylaws, sec. 7.

[13]University of Minnesota Libraries, Library Faculty Memo, Faculty Assembly Minutes, meeting of July 31, 1973, pp. 5, 8.

[14]Edwin E. Williams, "Harvard's Study Committee on Professional Library Personnel," Harvard Library Bulletin, XXI (July, 1973), pp. 289, 300. (Hereinafter referred to as "Harvard's Study Committee.")

[15]Harvard University Gazette, Oct. 13, 1973, pp. 1, 3.

[16]Williams, "Harvard's Study Committee," pp. 301, 307-08.

[17]Definitions of Librarian Ranks and Criteria for Appointment. (Mimeographed.) Penciled notes of copy sent by Philip Leinbach, Assistant University Librarian for Personnel, to this author.

[18]Williams, "Harvard's Study Committee," pp. 311-19.

[19]Faculty Tenure Statement for Texas A&M University Libraries.

[20]Questionnaire circulated to Henry L. Alsmeyer, questions 4, 5, 16, 17, 19, 20.

VI. EPILOGUE

The documentation on which this paper is based includes internal memoranda, personal letters, committee reports and minutes, library faculty and staff minutes, organizational charts, library and university wide policy statements, constitutions and bylaws, news items, and other material of an ephemeral nature. The very diversity of these materials tells us that individual libraries have great latitude in selecting their line of attack on problems of personnel organization. At the same time, the discussion of the three basic approaches--faculty status, participative management schemes, and parallel organizations based on local needs--is a "Casebook" of methods for altering staff organization.

The method of organization which will win greatest favor among academic librarians is by no means a foregone conclusion. Full faculty status has great appeal not just because it has precedents in the academic setting, but because it is now fully articulated in the ACRL standards, and the experience of an increasing number of libraries may serve as guideposts for brethren anxious to join the fold. Thus full faculty status has the lead in the race for "tool of choice" due to a combination of circumstances. However, new approaches such as UCLA's or parallel systems like Harvard's may prove irresistable if their successes show them to be superior for organizing academic libraries.

Academic librarians' attitudes toward faculty status and their under-

standing of what it entails[1] are not yet mature. The faculty systems discussed in this study are among the most highly developed in the country. Yet further articulation of all three is possible. Equally important, the library faculties at each school must gain a large amount of experience simply running the systems before we have a very clear idea of how effective the faculty model will be for academic libraries, or what modifications are necessary to make it effective.

Faculty governance is a product of the past century, which has been closely related to the struggle for academic freedom. One facet, tenure, is under serious attack, not to limit academic freedom, but because of undesirable concomitants of the tenure system, among them de facto job protection for tenured faculty members no matter what their performance. This assault is being pressed by public opinion, politicians and state administrative agencies. But it is also getting substantial support from within the academy from professors and students alike. To a certain extent it is unfortunate that librarians are gaining faculty status at such a time. It will certainly be necessary for them to look constructively at the criticisms leveled against faculty status.

Librarians have already modified faculty governance systems in some novel ways, such as including non-professorial staff and in some cases students. However, they have not been altogether imaginative. Each of the libraries discussed in this paper has combined their faculty systems with the old library administrative structures, and this conforms to the present norm in academic libraries. This combination is a sure sign of the immaturity of library faculty systems. When directors become deans, fullfilling a consultative role, and assistant and associate directors become assistant deans

or administrative aids without line authority, then libraries will have conformed closely to the faculty model. But this will require the basic change in the behavior and self concept of librarians which Arthur McAnally called for a decade and a half ago.[2]

Such changes will come in two forms, librarians' attitudes and also substantive functions, such as the right of Oklahoma library faculty to vote on new appointments.[3] It may be that the sticky wicket in establishing full status nationwide will be a combination of conservative institutions, resistance of teaching faculty, and timorous librarians lacking confidence in their ability to cope with the obligations accompanying the benefits of full faculty status.

Influential leadership appointed from within was heavily responsible for the development of UCLA's personnel organization based on participative management techniques. It may be that this leadership is the linchpin of the system, and that unless the "charisma" which it provided has become institutionalized[4] the system will not continue to work.

To be completely fair, however, we should look at participative schemes of organization in a new way. Because they embody the principles of behaviorism ("behavioralism") they may represent a kind of "engineered" work environment which is so reinforcing that the old system of leadership and authority becomes irrelevant. As the staff takes on the role of organizing and running the library and develops the institional loyalty which was formally characteristic of administrators, the director may become a liason for communication between academic library faculties and university administration. Above all an experimental attitude is indispensible to the maintenance of

a participative scheme like UCLA's. Certainly the threat of rigidity has not manifested itself in the Library Administrative Network. The attitude towards LAN is frankly experimental, and this is a sign that charisma is not becoming "routinized," but that behaviorism may be working.

The shortcomings of the Harvard system are related to two factors: the lack of a formally organized vehicle for librarian input into University wide decision making and the failure to establish the Library Senate, which would have provided continuity in the organization of the governance of Harvard's "federated" libraries. These problems were caused by two factors. Harvard librarians made the decision to develop a parallel system to the faculty, and ambiguous NLRB policy decisions confounded the full implementation of the "Reports" of the study committee. In spite of the fact that the Board's position is still not clear with regard to private university faculties, it seems likely that the adoption of a faculty system would have given some protection by placing the Harvard University Libraries under the umbrella of a long established institution. In addition, as part of the faculty Harvard librarians would have been able to influence decisions on fringe benefits and review procedures.

It would certainly be possible at this time to combine different aspects of the multitude of approaches available. The five university libraries examined in this study offer substantially different techniques for dealing with the problems which range from governance to academic freedom. Taken together as a kind of "ideal type," they may serve almost any university library and even college libraries in the search for means of transforming personnel organization. For instance, the characteristics of the participative management schemes are not inimical to the faculty system. UCLA's system in no way precludes faculty status for librarians. The two could be rationally combined.

One might speculate that the characteristics of "participative management," which generates concensus decisions based on significant input from all levels, will eventually make it the method most favored for organizing internal governance in libraries with large staffs. Whereas, a less complex faculty system will remain satisfactory for governance in institutions which have staffs sufficiently small to facilitate the communication which has been institutionalized at UCLA. On the other hand, in speaking to the University faculty and administration, faculty status seems to have the advantage for librarians over parallel, even equivalent ranks, because it places librarians in a peer relationship with the faculty. Faculty status is certainly more advantageous in the area of fringe benefits. Moreover, in the matter of appointment and promotion, the faculty model is both practical and adaptable. It provides a scheme of peer evaluation and due process which is applicable to both faculty and participative management organization, or to the system suggested above which combines featutes of both.

Whatever the outcome, it appears that the "decision" to change the status of librarians has been made by circumstances. Apparently we are now faced with a set of conditions which mean that changes must occur. Resistance to these transformations will continue, but will prevail only to the extent of adapting the new organizational models in specific instances to local needs. The end of this period of flux in library personnel systems can only come when a substantial shift to new forms of organization rationalizes academic library personnel systems to these circumstances.

REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER VI

[1]E. J. Josey, "Full Faculty Status This Century: The Report of the Survey of New York State Academic Librarians," Library Journal, IIIC (March 15, 1972), 984-89. Virgil F. Massman, Faculty Status for Librarians (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press Inc., 1972), p. 11-15.

[2]Robert B. Downs, ed., The Status of American College and University Librarians, ACRL Monograph No. 22 (Chicago: American Library Association, 1958), p. 36.

[3]See p. 53.

[4]For the fully developed theory of the "routinization" of charismatic leadership see Max Weber, The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, trans. with introduction by Talcott Parsons (New York: Oxford University Press Inc., 1947), pp. 363-73.